

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXXII.

OCTOBER, 1867.

ARTICLE I.

LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN HUSS.

By Rev. J. J. SMYTH, A. M., Pleasantville, Pa.

At the point where the river Rhine emerges from the Lake of Constance, stands beautiful for situation, the city of the same name. In the year 1414, there was a great stir in this city. Not only were the houses crowded, but booths were erected in the streets, and the adjacent fields were occupied by hundreds of sojourners. Cardinals, archbishops, bishops and other churchmen of various grades, with not a few princes, counts and nobles of different ranks flaunted in their robes of office, and no doubt looked very imposing in the eyes of the populace, for that was the golden age of silver-sticks and man-millinery, and all the pomp and pageantry of civil and ecclesiastical assemblages. "Religious processions, dramatic representations, and entertainments of every description, hourly succeeded each other; and thousands of individuals were employed solely in transporting thither the choicest delicacies of Europe."* The occasion of all this stir, was a

* McCulloch's Geo. Dict.

religious Council, that was about to convene in the *kaufhaus* (market hall) of Constance, a solemn assemblage of solemn bigwigs, representing the collective wisdom, to say nothing of the collective ignorance, superstition and intolerance, of what was then called Christendom. There were many and very important objects * before this council which was convened by the authority of the Emperor Sigismund, but the most urgent one was to determine who was the real Pope, or whether there was any such thing as a real pope; and also to devise some means whereby the popes might mend their manners, and the manners of the very extensive flock over which they claimed pre-eminence. It was a sad age for Christianity, that golden age of silver-sticks; apart from all considerations of true spiritual religion, it was a sad age, too, for popes, cardinals and other church dignitaries. Very unseemly and bitter broils had arisen between parties who raised the one cry of doctrine and discipline.

The Roman pontiffs owed a good deal in those times (as they have done in later days) to the interference of foreign powers; and France, and the kings of France, having done much to secure the power and enlarge the territory of the popes, very naturally thought that they had some claim to a voice in the Papal elections. The Italians however, thought differently. They claimed a monopoly in the business of choosing popes. A fierce contest thus arose between the French party and the Italian party, so fierce, indeed, that from A. D. 1309, after the archbishop of Bourdeaux, by the artful intrigues of Philip the Fair, king of France, had been elected pope, and on for a period of seventy years, the papal residence was fixed at Avignon, and there the popes became, as the Germans and Italians averred, the minions and tools of France. Such a state of things naturally tended to a schism in the papedom. The Italians concluded that the easiest way to settle the difficulty was to elect a pope of their own, who would fix his head-quarters in the legitimate and time-honored chair of St. Peter, at Rome: and thus there was a pope at Rome, and another at Avignon, for a period of forty years. And, at last, so fruitful of popes was that age, that no fewer than *three* pretenders to the chair of the fisherman, severally, laid claim to infallibility. For when

* *Vide* L'Enfant's Hist. of the Council of Constance.

the council of Pisa, A. D. 1409, thought to settle the difficulty by electing a pope who was, in his own person, to heal the wounds of the dismembered Church, the new pontiff, notwithstanding the oath which he with the other cardinals had taken before the election, "not to dissolve, nor suffer to be dissolved the present council, before a sufficient reformation of the whole Church, both in the head and members, had been effected," acted in the old papal fashion, and almost immediately dismissed the assembly that had appointed him: and the two reigning popes, Gregory XII., supported by several of the Italian States, and many German bishops, and Benedict XIII., with Spain and Scotland at his back, manifested no intention of retiring in favor of the new comer, and so we read of three contemporaneous popes, Gregory XII., Benedict XIII., and Alexander V., the Pisan pope, who on his death was succeeded by John XXIII., from which circumstance it would appear that, if the faithful of those times were under the obligation (as they undoubtedly were) of paying their money; they also had an opportunity of taking their choice.

Three popes! Why, some people are wicked enough to think that one pope is bad enough. But what must it have been with three? And, indeed, so it was very bad with the poor church of the fifteenth century; and the sight of the three popes began to open men's eyes, and cause them to see some things they had overlooked before; although it seems never to have come into their minds to examine the foundation on which the popedom itself was erected. Very few of these popes were even moderately good men, their own friends being the judges. Indeed, according to the same judgment, some of them were decidedly bad men, or rather monsters of iniquity; and the bad example of such prominent ecclesiastics soon descended to the inferior clergy. Of a truth, the least said about the moral character of the clergy, both secular and regular, is far the best for their memory and our edification. But it may give us an idea of their capability, as instructors of the people, if we hint that very many of them were unable to go through the ordinary forms of service and offices of baptism; and some of them were even unable to recite the Apostles' Creed. So men began to grumble, as men under such circumstances will do. They began to use such words as "reform," "shameful abuses," and the like. A few thoughtful men, now began

to question things, at first timidly : but one question led on to another, until at last dogmas that were supposed to lie at the very root of Christianity were taken for what they were really worth. A few years before this time, there appeared a book "Defensor Pacis," by Marsilius of Padua and John of Jardun, in which were set forth among other important truths, the parity of the ministry, the authority of Scripture alone in matters of faith, that Christ and not Peter was the Rock on which the Church was built. About the same time there came over the seas, from a barbarous island, called Britain, the protest of an arch-heretic, called Wycliffe. And, even the University of Paris, devoted as its members mainly were to the Papacy, and the dogmas of the Church, sent forth a loud and unmistakable demand through the mouth of its chancellor De Gerson, for a reform in both the head and the members of the Church, and that a stop should be put to the doings of the three popes and their various factions and parties. For this purpose chiefly the Council of Constance was summoned, in the year of grace 1414. How well it discharged its duty, and secured the reforms it was constituted to effect, is for history, and not for us, to say ; but if we confine ourselves to the single case in connection with the Council of Constance, which has led us to refer to it at all, and if we were to form our judgment from that case, we shall not be very likely to augur favorably of its other deliberations and actions. The case to which we refer is that of JOHN HUSS, to a sketch of whose life, acts and suffering, we propose to devote a few pages.

His Early Life and Training.

John Huss, which is in Latin Johannes Anser, that is, John "Goose"—was born in Hussinecz, a Bohemian village, on the borders of Bavaria, in the year 1373. Like Luther, and many other great men, he sprang from a humble parentage. In early life he was inured to labor and privation, and thus laid a foundation for the fortitude and firmness which afterwards so highly distinguished him. He managed, however, to get an education first in his own town, then in Prasehalitz, and in due time, in the famous University, in the fine old city of Prague. This University was at that time in the height of its renown and popularity, and was thronged by thousands of students in philosophy and theology. The University of Prague

was governed by a council, composed of Germans and Bohemians; and at the time, in which Huss studied within its walls, the votes of the council were so distributed that the Germans always had the preponderance. It so happened that the views of these two parties were anything but harmonious. The Bohemian section had a strong tendency toward reform, while their German associates resisted all change. Some forty years before the time that Huss was at the University, Conrad Stieckna, a preacher at Prague, inveighed severely against the depravity of the clergy and the monks. After Stieckna, Militz who voluntarily resigned the office of archdeacon in the Cathedral Church of Prague, came down heavily upon the vices of the clergy, and added weight to his admonitions, by taking the humble position of Sacristan, and devoting himself to a sort of home missionary work in Prague and the surrounding country. And a few years later, Matthias, of Janow, a curate of Prague, went even farther than the others in his invectives against priestly immorality, denouncing the clergy, both regular and secular, in the most severe terms for their hypocrisy and worldliness.* In his book "*De Regulis Veteris et Novi Testamenti*," he exhibits the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, and treats the practice of image worship, then so prevalent, after a highly Protestant fashion. Moreover, an influence from the University of Oxford was at this time extensively felt in the University of Prague. The close relations of the English and Bohemian monarchies, as of their respective Universities, had brought the views of Wycliffe prominently before the students of Prague. The doctrines and propositions of Wycliffe were carefully examined, and no doubt the students participated in the usual degree of that amiable feeling called the "*odium theologicum*," which usually accompanies controversies on religious questions. In fact, both in the constitution of the University of Prague, and in the peculiar circumstances of thought and discussion prevalent at this period, there was a foundation for a very bitter quarrel, if only some one could be found to set it going and keep it moving. As is usually the case, when the hour was ready, the man was forthcoming. After the usual course of study, Huss was graduated in A. D., 1393, and Master of Arts in 1396; and with his degree he

* Vide Geiseler's note, § 122.

obtained a well merited reputation for wisdom, learning and piety; so much so, as to gain for him the distinguished office of President of the Faculty of Theology in 1401; and to procure the favorable notice of Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, and of his Queen Sophia, to whom he became private chaplain some time after he received holy orders.

The Bethlehem Chapel.

Preaching after the manner of the Apostle Paul or the Bishop of Hippo, has never been a very favorite institution in the Church of Rome. To be sure preachers like Tetzels, whose text was "Down with the money," enjoyed much favor with the popes and cardinals; but the preaching of the gospel of Christ, was by no means, a *sine qua non* with these dignitaries. In the year 1391, there was no place in the city of Prague, where there was anything like preaching for the people. Of course there was the fine Gothic cathedral, surmounted with its lantern-crown, adorned with paintings, and served by priests of all sorts and sizes, there were churches, there were "*conciones ad clericos*," in very good monkish Latin, and panegyrics of saints, mixed up with what John Locke calls jargon of school-men, in a *patois* half Latin and half Bohemian: but of sound Gospel teaching, a plain unfolding of the great truths of salvation, that could be understood by the mass of the people, there was a total want. There were some meetings held by men who went about the city, in private houses and obscure places, "*per domos et latebras*;" but some men of influence and wealth began to think it was a crying shame that in so famous a city, the seat of so learned a university, and the See of an Archbishop, there should not be a single pulpit around which all might gather to hear regularly and constantly the Gospel of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To remedy this evil, and in some measure to supply this great want, John of Mülhkeim, a royal counselor of Bohemia, and a merchant named Kreutz, resolved, in the year 1391, to found a chapel, in which the word of God should be regularly preached. The nobleman lent his name and influence to the undertaking, and the merchant gave his money, and the result was *Bethlehem Chapel*—a place famous in the history of John Huss, and a name embalmed in the traditions of his followers.

The spirit which actuated, and the end aimed at by the

founders of this house of God, is manifested in the original title deed of the foundation, which runs thus: "I, John of Milhelm, desiring both the salvation of my own soul, and the spiritual refreshing of many Christian believers, and carefully pondering the thought, that in the city of Prague, although there are many places set apart for divine worship, yet they are for the most part occupied for many other sacred purposes, so that not one spot in the city is specially dedicated to the particular use of preaching the word of God, and that the preachers themselves, especially those who preach in the common language of Bohemia, are obliged, which is well known they frequently do, to wander about through private dwellings and obscure places: therefore, moved by this consideration, and anxiously desiring to procure an increase of the said holy preaching, have determined and arranged to erect a chapel in honor of the Holy Innocents, on the ground of the good and wise man Kreutz, a citizen of the city of Prague, which ground the said Kreutz has piously donated for the purpose, and which chapel I have resolved to call *Bethlehem*, that is the 'house of bread,' for this reason, that in it the common people and believers ought to be refreshed with the bread of holy preaching." To this chapel, thus founded, Huss was appointed preacher in the year 1402; and his zeal and eloquence soon testified the wisdom of the appointment. His glowing and evangelical discourses gathered around him a crowd of ardent admirers, many of whom became his warm and steady friends; while his great intercourse with the poorer classes of the people opened out to him such an amount of ignorance and vice, the accumulation of long years of priestly apathy and neglect, that his reforming tendencies were quickened to more active life, and his rebukes to his clerical brethren pointed with a sharper edge. Nothing ever uttered by Luther, even when his righteous indignation was kindled to a white heat, is more withering than the eloquent and scathing invectives uttered by Huss, as contained in the "*Conciones Synodice*."

In forming our estimate of Huss and others in Bohemia as reformers, we must not overlook the fact that they aimed more at a reform of manners than of doctrine: and in this respect the Bohemian preachers presented a contrast to Wycliffe in the reform he inaugurated, a short time previously in England. There is no evidence that

Huss ever controverted or abandoned the distinctive doctrines of Romanism; although it is evident that he gave a spiritual interpretation to most of them, as to transubstantiation, the power of the Pope, &c. Indeed it is highly probable that if his life had been spared, and it is almost certain if his lot had been cast a century later, he would have gone as far as the later reformers. But still in forming our opinion of Huss, it must be remembered that the object he had in view was this—the preaching of the Gospel as in the Scriptures, apart from human traditions and glosses, a reform of the scandalous and immoral lives of the clergy, and a redress of those obvious and crying abuses, which all thinking men of the age concurred to deprecate and condemn. That he was led on insensibly to see more and more of the truth, and of its incompatibility with the then system of the Church, is true; but the former statement is, withal, no less true.

At the beginning of his ministry in Bethlehem chapel, and in his denunciations of prevailing abuses, the archbishop Sbynko, showed himself the friend, and for a while the coadjutor of Huss. That prelate, though by no means a man of spiritual mind, nor of the stuff of which reformers and martyrs are made, was still not blind to the abuses which surrounded him; he for a while encouraged Huss in his bold opposition to them, and took even a prominent part in denouncing and putting down a piece of imposture, which, under different phases, turns up again and again in the annals of the Roman Church.

Huss was one of three commissioners that were sent by the archbishop to investigate an alleged miracle at Wil-snack. The church at this place had been destroyed by some warlike knight, in the preceding century; no part of the building was left except a portion of a stone altar. In a hole in this altar it was given out that three wafers were discovered, which were covered with a red deposit. Whether this was so or not, it served the purpose of the monks, who thought that they could give a profitable, if not a philosophical, solution of the phenomenon. So they asserted that the wafers were covered with the blood of Christ. They do not seem to have thought that this was rather inconsistent with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which implied a change of the *substance*, but not a change of the *accidents*. The monks cried out, *A miracle! A miracle!* and men came flocking from France and

and Switzerland, and Norway and Sweden, to see the blood-red wafers. The matter, of course, excited a great stir, and the archbishop, as I have said, sent three Masters of the University to sift it out, and that he intended that the investigation should not be a sham, is clear, from the appointment of Huss as one of the commissioners. And the business was well and honestly done, and the monks were covered with confusion and disgrace. By order of the archbishop, the pilgrimage was denounced from the altars of all the parish churches, and nothing more was for a good while heard of the three red wafers.

Thus far Huss and the prelate got along famously; but their ways soon began to be divergent. "As long as Huss confined himself to the sins of the laity, he was universally lauded; but as soon as he attacked the Pope and the clergy, bringing to light their pride, avarice, simony, and other vices, and showing that they ought not to have any possessions, the whole priesthood was arrayed against him as one possessed of the devil, and an arch-heretic." Indeed it could hardly be expected that the worldly, wealthy prince-bishop of the worldly wealthy church, would part with all his ease and honors, and tread the difficult and dangerous path chosen by the undaunted and self-denying minister of Bethlehem chapel.

Bohemians versus Germans.

The position that Huss had taken, was beset with dangers. To attack vigorously the vices of a large and influential body of men, is not the high road to gain their favor. The manner in which he denounced the idleness, and ignorance, and profligacy, and rapacity of the clergy, however conscious they might be that they deserved all they got, was sure to call forth a storm of wrathful indignation.

Richard II. of England, had married the sister of the king of Bohemia. This produced a certain intercourse between the two countries, and that at the very time that Wycliffe and his doctrines were making a great sensation in the ecclesiastical world. The works of Wycliffe were well known in the Bohemian University. Æneas Sylvius, speaking of the preaching of Huss in the Bethlehem chapel, says: "He quoted largely from the books of John Wycliffe, asserting that they contained all truth, and that

he frequently exclaimed while preaching, that when he died, he wanted to go where the soul of Wycliffe would be, for he was sure that he was a good and holy man, and worthy of Heaven." *

Jerome, a noble man of Prague, whom they called Rotten-fish, "*Vir genere nobilis ex domo quam Putridi piscis vocant,*" a steadfast friend of Huss to the last, had visited Oxford, and brought home with him the works and principles of the English Reformer. The greater portion of the Bohemian party in the University, joined themselves to Huss and Jerome; and the king, perhaps from motives of policy, espoused the same cause. This party revived the ordinance of Charles IV., giving special privileges to the native over the foreign students. This greatly exasperated the Germans and Poles, who loudly exclaimed against the admirers of Wycliffe, and demanded their submission or expulsion. We have already noticed the constitution of the University of Prague. It was divided into what was technically called "four nations," each "nation" having a vote in the governing council. But the Bohemians had only one vote, and consequently were always liable to be overborne by the foreigners, who could muster three votes to their one. Forty-five propositions, embodying the doctrines of Wycliffe, were now dragged up to trial; and, notwithstanding, the exertions of Huss, Jerome and some others, were incontinently condemned; and the German party flushed with victory, sought to crush out the remains of heresy, by moving the Pope to thunder forth a bull against Wycliffeism, with which prayer he complied; at the same time commanding Sbynko or Sbynek the arch-bishops, to proclaim the bull in his arch-diocese, which he unhesitatingly did, with all the circumstance and ceremony—ringing of bells and snuffing out of candles—with which such things were and are usually done. But for this time the Germans and malcontent bishops overshot the mark. Huss and Jerome, and the Bohemian party, and, what was still more King Wenceslaus and Queen Sophia stood up right manfully for the honor and privileges of their own University. "Out upon you, you gross foreigners," they said, "what business have you to meddle with what does not belong to you!" "But then the bull, your Majesty," pleaded the Germans. "We'll take the bull by the horns,"

* Gieseler, §149, Note 4.

said the King. "And the archbishop!" continued the Germans. "The archbishop is my subject, and if he knows what is good for him, he will keep a civil tongue in his head," answered his Majesty. "But then our *three* votes," suggested the Germans, mildly of course, but under the impression all the time, that this last was a poser. "Oh! the votes," said Wenceslaus, "the votes, that must be looked to." And so it was looked to, and a complete revolution took place in the constitution of the University. The royal ordinance of January 18, 1409, was issued, by which three votes were given to the Bohemians instead of one, and to the Germans three, as had hitherto been the case. This so disgusted the Germans that they left the University, one fine morning, in a body, to the number of at least five thousand—though some say, as many as forty thousand. And John Huss soon after, was installed in the honorable, but perilous office of Rector of the University, which had thus given effect to the national cry of "*Bohemia for the Bohemians!*"

We have called the position a "dangerous" one; and so it proved. The warfare did not stop. The conflict, henceforward, was between the University and the Cathedral. Still Huss had not yet completely broken with the archbishop, for in 1410, he was appointed by him, to preach before the assembled Synod of the diocese, in which he took occasion to have another blow at the vices of the clergy. His dangers, however, were thickening. The five thousand or forty thousand Germans who left the University of Prague, naturally thought that the best thing they could do was to set up a University for themselves; and so they established an opposition one at Leipsic, and began to do a thriving business, to the no small injury of the old institution. It was no doubt, a fine cry at first, the cry of "*Bohemia for the Bohemians;*" but as soon as the patriotic burghers had done throwing up their caps and cheering, they began to think of thalers and pennings, and the injury accruing to the trade of Prague, by the withdrawal of so large a body of people from their community. It was all to no purpose, that Huss said, "Nobody drove the Germans away, their own oath alone drove them away; they pledged themselves, on penalty of excommunication, and a fine of sixty groats, that not one of them would remain at the University." This was a poor consolation to the traders of Prague. Every one of these Germans consumed

bread and meat, and beer and broadcloth, and this consumption was not to be replaced by eloquence and reform: and so John Huss began to sink in the estimation of many of his fellow citizens, who felt that *argumentum ad crumenam*, so practically put by the anti-reformers, too powerful and convincing to be resisted.

A variety of circumstances, therefore, now combined against our reformer. The great body of the clergy hated him, because he denounced their vices, the archbishop disliked him, because he opposed, and at times got the better of him, the Germans detested him as Rector of the University, and many of the Bohemians were ill affected towards him, because his patriotic zeal had poorly answered their schemes of commercial profit. A few more feathers would break the camel's back, and Huss was not slow to lay them on; for he was a man bold and firm in what he considered to be the cause of right, a man who believed he had a mission to root out hollow hypoerisies and hoary abuses, a man who did not pause to count his foes, ere he laid his lance in rest; but was prepared, if it were a need-be, to do battle against all odds; and on the sole but sure foundation of his faith in God, to outface the wicked world.

The Burning of Wycliffe's Books.

"Huss now stood at the head of the theologians of Prague, and as a preacher exerted a wonderful influence on the people." In truth the churches of the city were nearly emptied, and the Bethlehem chapel was unable to contain even a moiety of the crowds, comprising the noblest in the land, who flocked to hear the bold and eloquent preacher. This, of course, displeased the priests, and so they stirred up archbishop Sbynko, to make a formal complaint against Huss. Alexander V., whom the council of Pisa had just elected as pope, thus pronouncing the other two shams, issued a bull, empowering Sbynko to shut up all private chapels, and * ordering a commission to sit on Wycliffs' writings. The nobility and the people rallied around Huss, and would not allow the doors of his

* Geiseler says, Alexander V., ordered Wycliffe's writings to be burned. This was probably the case, but I preferred putting it as I have done, inferring that a commission for investigation was previously appointed, from the wording of the resolution by the University, in which the prelates are mentioned with the archbishop.

chapel to be closed; and Huss, himself, resting upon the charter upon which the chapel was founded, appealed from the pope badly informed, to the pope better informed—a civil way of putting off obedience to the mandate, to a very distant day. The commission on the books, however, soon found them guilty of flat heresy, and for want of Wycliffe himself, condemned them to be burned, with all fitting and public solemnity. The Bohemians did not like this. They were afraid that if the priests once got the smell of fire, it was hard to say what they would burn before they stopped; and the University, too, protested against the sentence. A resolution was passed June 15, 1410, "*Quod Universitas nullo modo consentit Archiepiscopo Pragensi Sbinconi cum suis Praelatis in combustionem librorum Magistri Johannis Wicklif.*" The archbishop, however, got a guard of soldiers about his palace, and made a bonfire of the books to the number of two hundred, in his stable yard. The people were greatly incensed, and the tumult they raised was not quelled without bloodshed, and the loss of life. The hostility to the archbishop was manifested in other ways. It seems there were ballad singers in Prague in those days, and they did not spare even this high church dignitary. The following is the lamentation of one of his friends: "The Reverened Father, Lord Archbishop Sbynko, laboring with a holy zeal for the extermination of these evils, and above all for the extermination of the poisoned source of them all, Wycliffe and his sacrilegious doctrines, was, through the disobedience and rebellion of Master Huss, made such an object of contempt and sport to the people, that they composed and sang vulgar and satirical ballads on this man of God, and, that too, publicly through the streets, because, of his most righteous burning of the books of that most depraved heretic." The burthen of the songs was, "The archbishop has to learn his alphabet, he has burned books without knowing what was in them!" Huss himself said: "I call book-burning a poor affair, such burning never yet removed a single sin from the hearts of men, but has only destroyed many truths, many beautiful and delicately written thoughts, and multiplied among the people disturbances, enmities, slanders, hatreds and murders, &c."

Excommunication.

Alexander V., died May 3, 1410, and was succeeded by

the infamous John XXIII., who very probably made the vacancy by poisoning his predecessor. This John was but one of three popes; but it would have been difficult for either Benedict or Gregory to rival him on the score of wickedness. Men said that John was as bad as the worst of his predecessors, which was saying a great deal for him. To this pope, for want of a better, Huss resolved to make a last appeal. So strong and spirited was the language, as well as the arguments employed, that a commission of Doctors condemned the action of the archbishop as irregular. In this document he insisted upon the Scriptures and right reason as the only sources of the knowledge of truth, and said some things of transubstantiation, which implied so spiritual a conception of the doctrine, as would lead us to suppose, if he had lived long enough, he would have come out into the clear light of Scripture, regarding it. He gives utterance, also, to this noble resolution, which he kept faithfully to the end, "I avow it to be my purpose, to defend the truth of God's Scripture, even unto death, since I know that the truth stands, and is forever mighty, and abides eternally."

These words were not mere sound and flourish. He that took up arms against that terrible system, before which kings and emperors had quailed, and gone down, had need to have no fears of death. The cardinals, bishops, and priests who had long clamored for his condemnation, now raised the cry of heresy against him; and the bolt was at last hurled, Huss was excommunicated, and ordered to quit Prague, and the city placed under an interdict so long as he should remain there. The king, however, and his queen did not desert their friend and chaplain; so that at first, the sentence fell with but little force on Huss, who was strongly sustained by a very large party in the city. The advantage was decidedly with the Hussites. The reformer came back to his chapel, from which he had withdrawn for a season, and preached with greater vehemence than ever, against the prevailing corruptions; while the Archbishop, enraged at the conduct of Wenceslaus, and the hostility of the people, fled from Bohemia, to appeal to Sigismund. In this journey he was suddenly cut off by death, and was succeeded by Albic, a man who cared but little for religious controversies. But more serious troubles were looming up in the near future.

The Pope's Bull.

The sentence of excommunication was still hanging over Huss, at the time of the archbishop's death, although the latter, probably terrified at the popular indignation against the measure, and the opposition of the king, had written a letter to the pope, in which he not only withdrew all accusations of heresy that had been laid against the reformer, but begged for the sentence of excommunication to be recalled. The letter ran thus: "I know of no heresies prevailing in the Kingdom of Bohemia, the city of Prague, or marquisate of Moravia, nor of any individual guilty of the charge, for which punishment should now be or hitherto have been inflicted. Moreover, I and Master John Huss, as well as the other Doctors and Masters of the University of Prague, have fully settled every dispute and quarrel that had sprung up between us. I, therefore, beseech your Holiness to cancel and annul your excommunication and censures, which they had occasioned." This letter, however, was never sent.

Such was the state of affairs. Huss excommunicated—king Wenceslaus siding with Huss, and at logger heads with pope and priests, three infallible pontiffs all reigning at once, and a moral gangrene covering the *corpus ecclesiasticum*, when a new element of trouble was thrown in, which made the chance of compromise or reconciliation almost hopeless. Ladislaus, king of Naples, refused to acknowledge the Pisan pope, and still supported the claims of Gregory XII. John determined, if possible, to bring him to terms; and, according to the approved fashion of the times, first called Ladislaus "a heretic, a schismatic, a man guilty of high treason against the Majesty of God!" and then proclaimed a crusade against him, with a bull granting a full indulgence (*indulgentiam omnium peccatorum*) to all who would take part in it; and as he wanted money as well as men, he offered an equal pardon of all sin, to those who preferred contributing money to exposing themselves to the risk of active service. A century later, an indulgence proclaimed by a better man, and for a better object, roused the thunder of Martin Luther, and shivered the Papal power to atoms, through the length and breadth of Germany. And from what we have seen of the temper and disposition of John Huss, we

can readily imagine that he would not remain very quiet, when such an order was issued, by such a man, for such an object. The new archbishop, Albic, said to him, "Obey the Apostolic mandate, and read the bull of crusade and indulgence in your church!" His courteous, but firm reply was, "I am always ready to obey the Apostolical mandates; but I beg you to understand, I call Apostolical mandates the doctrines of Peter and Paul, the Apostles of Christ: all Papal mandates that agree with these, I shall obey willingly; but whatever be contrary thereto, I shall not obey, though death itself be the penalty!" Such was John Huss, in the hour of danger! A man undaunted in the cause of truth, bearing a bold, explicit testimony to the faith, in the presence and hearing of its enemies, armed with all the terrific powers of this world.

The king and the University, that had hitherto supported him, now, when the storm was thickening, from motives of State policy, sided with the pope, and permitted this iniquitous bull to be published throughout the city and kingdom. But Huss had taken his stand on the question of indulgences, and for a man like him, retreat or compromise was an impossibility. He forthwith issued two tracts against the papal bulls. And certainly in discussing the question, "*Utrum secundum legem Jesu Christi licet et expedit pro honore Dei, et salute populi, a pro commodo regni bullas papæ de erectione crucis contra Ladislaum regem Apuliæ et suos complices Christi fidelibus approbare!*" he handles the matter in a very thorough and Luther like fashion. He shows that it is the prerogative of God only to freely forgive sins: that the priests of Christ cannot announce that the simple confession of sin frees from its guilt, but upon the following conditions, "*Si dolet, et nolit peccare amplius, et confidit de Dei misericordia, et vult imposterum mandata Dei observare.*" Huss was powerfully seconded in his opposition, by his firm and brave friend Jerome of Prague. The enthusiasm of the students was intense for Huss and his friend, though Stanislaus and Stephen Paletz, his old teachers, and who had hitherto supported him, now joined the clerical party; and, indeed the latter became his fiercest enemy, and his principal accuser at the Council of Constance. The fury of his followers was with difficulty restrained. In fact a demonstration took place, which, as has frequently, on similar

occasions been made in other places, may be called a demonstration congenial to students and mob-nature. Towards evening, a mock procession was formed, with much shouting and gesticulation, and much preparation of faggots and other combustibles. The bull was suspended on the neck of a lewd woman of the town, and having been paraded ostentatiously before the palace of the archbishop and other obnoxious places, was conveyed to a ditch, where the faggots had been piled up, and there shared the fate which a year before had befallen the two hundred books of Wycliffe. It is but fair to say, that Huss had no hand in this proceeding. Indeed, he publicly deplored and denounced the indiscretion of his too enthusiastic admirers.

On the day appointed for the general publication of the bull of crusade and indulgence, a circumstance of more solemn import occurred to enlist his sympathies and draw forth his denunciations. On that day when the bull was read, and the priests were beginning to open their wares for sale, three young artizans of the city, with nothing but Christian names, Martin, John and Stazek, stepping forward, said to the officiating priest, "Thou liest! Master Huss has taught us better than that: we know it is all false." Dire was the wrath of the priests, and a terrible tumult was excited. The soldiers at once seized the young men with only Christian names, and without more ado hurried them off to the magistrates, who summarily condemned them to death. Huss was soon informed what had taken place, and accompanied by Jerome and followed with some two thousand students, hastened to the door of the council house. There they vehemently protested against the proceedings, "Men," said they, "no matter how humble their station, must not be put to death thus like dogs, in the good city of Prague, for an idle word. Here are two thousand of us, ready to say the same word; and so we look upon their cause as our own." The magistrates awed by this demonstration, adopted a conciliatory tone, and promised that no blood should be shed. Huss and his party trusting their word went away and dispersed in quietness. But as soon as the danger was past, a large body of soldiers was summoned, and, in the presence of an enraged multitude, the unfortunate three were beheaded. This step, instead of

allaying, only increased, the commotion. Here, as always, the death of martyrs, begets a spirit of martyrdom. When the multitude heard of the execution, they cried out: "We are all ready to do the like, and share the death of these!" Some dipped their handkerchiefs in the blood, women brought linen to enshroud the bodies, and strong men rang the alarm bell, to summon the students to the spot. And that night, there was another procession, more solemn than the former one: the bodies were borne at the head of a vast multitude, and reverently deposited in front of the altar in Bethlehem chapel. There, in that consecrated place, the graves were dug, and in that chapel dimly lit with tapers, solemn dirges were chanted, and as the bodies were lowered to the tomb, Huss spoke burning words, which sank into the hearts of those that heard him. Many things besides prayers were said, in the church that night; nay, so strong and deep were the feelings created by this occurrence, that Bethlehem chapel, already famous as the preaching place of Huss, was now doubly famous as the chapel of the three saints—meaning the three men with only Christian names, martyrs of the false magistrates, and the canonized of the multitude.

The Second Excommunication and the Withdrawal of Huss from Prague.

The stand that the king had taken in favor of the bull, the bitter hostility of Stanislaus and Paletz, his old teachers; and the determination of the new archbishop, Conrad of Vechta, who had supplanted the vacillating follower of Sbynko, made it evident, that Huss, though supported by a strong party in the University, and countenanced by the Queen, who still attended Bethlehem chapel, could not hope to prevail against the powerful organization of his enemies. Huss was allowed twenty days within which to recant various doctrines that he was alleged to have advanced, and which, as they pertained chiefly to the power of priestly absolution, and the worship of relics, it was certain that he did hold. If he did not submit within the specified time, he was to be excommunicated the second time, with double the amount of bell ringing and candle extinguishing, which celebrated his former sentence. It was also decreed, that Bethlehem chapel was to be razed to the ground, as a pernicious nest of heresy.

The reformer had no idea of submission, and the ban of

excommunication pronounced. It was easier to do this, however, than to carry out the portion of the order relating to the chapel. The students, and many of the nobles rallied around their beloved church, the shrine of the three artizans who had lately borne testimony to the truth, and the scene of the labors of the man whom they loved and honored. But that the disturbance might be allayed, Huss yielded to the advice of his friends, and the urgent solicitations of the king, and resolved to leave his beloved city, and the University, and chapel so dear to him, until matters would become somewhat more tranquil.

In his retirement, he was far from being idle. He spent a profitable leisure, writing books and tracts, corresponding with the members of his old congregation, and paying secret visits, confirming the zeal of his adherents. During this retirement, he published a short, but most pungent treatise, entitled, the "Six Errors." The *first* error was that the priests, teaching that any of their body was able to create the body of Christ in the mass, and thus become the father and creator of their own Creator. The *second* was that men are bound to believe in the virgin, the pope or saints, and not in God only. Here he pointed out the important distinction between *credere homini* and *credere in hominem*. The *third* error was, that priests were able to remit the guilt and penalty of sin to whom they pleased. The *fourth* was, that *subordinates*, (*subditi*) were bound to render implicit obedience to all commands of superiors; *licitis sive illicitis*. The *fifth* was that every excommunication, just and unjust, binds the excommunicated, affects him injuriously, severs him from the communion of the faithful, and deprives him of the sacraments of the Church. And the *sixth* was simony, which he calls a heresy, and of which he said that a greater part of the clergy, *proh dolor!* was guilty.

Huss continued to preach at this time, in different towns in the kingdom, and to immense crowds; that he might be nearer Prague, he moved his residence from Hussinetz to the Castle of Cracowitz, which had been offered him as a residence. No temporizing policy curbed his fiery indignation, and the numerous treatises and sermons which came from his pen, testify to the ardor of his zeal, and love for the truth. Among the works which he wrote at this time, were the treatise on the "Abomination of the Monks," the purport of which, is sufficiently

explained by the title, and another, entitled "The Members of Anti-Christ," a vigorous and fearful exposure of the vices and disorders of the Pope and his court.

Constance.

The year 1414 drew on, and with it the famous Council of Constance. Called together, at the instigation of the Emperor Sigismund, avowedly to consider, and if possible heal, or at least salve over, the numerous disorders under which the Church was laboring, it was eminently fitting that one who had signalized himself in the cause of re-form, should be summoned before it. The Emperor offered Huss a safe-conduct to the Council, pledging in the most solemn manner, his royal word, that he should go, abide and return unharmed. This document, the violation of which stamps such indelible disgrace upon all concerned, Emperor, Pope, cardinals, abbots and priests, and which modern Romanists have so much endeavored to conceal, obscure or deny, ran thus: "Sigismund, by the grace of God, king of the Romans, &c., to all princes, ecclesiastical and secular, &c., and to all our other subjects, greeting: We commend with full affection, to you—to all collectively, and to each in particular, the honorable Master John Huss, Bachelor in Divinity, and Master of Arts, the bearer of these presents, travelling from Bohemia to the Council of Constance, whom we have taken under the protection and safeguard—*protectionem et tutelam*—of ourself and the holy empire, enjoining upon you to receive and treat him kindly, furnishing him with whatever is necessary for a speedy and safe journey, whether by land or water, without taking anything from himself or his friends—under any pretence whatever, and that every impediment being removed, ye permit him to pass, sojourn, stop and return, and if necessary, to furnish him and his with a sure and safe-conduct for the honor and respect of our Majesty—"Omni prorsus impedimento remoto transire, stare, morari et redire libere permittatis sibi que et suis, cum opus fuerit, de securo et salvo velit et debeatis providere conductu, ad honorem et reverentiam nostræ Magistatis"—Given at Spire, this 18th day of October, in the year 1414, the third of our reign in Hungary, and the fifth of that of the Romans."

Huss relying upon this document, proceeded upon his journey. He passed through Prague on his way, and thus

paid one brief visit, which was to be the last to his beloved chapel. Here he received a cordial welcome, but in the midst of congratulations, there were whispers of caution, which bade him beware of trusting too much to the word of the Emperor. One honest fellow, a tailor, by birth a Pole, and by name, Andrew—he, too, had only a Christian name, wept as Huss departed, and followed him with many a blessing: “God be with thee, for hardly do I think, thou wilt get back unharmed, dearest Master John, and most steadfast in the truth: not the King of Hungary, but the King of Heaven reward thee for the true and good instruction I have received from thee!” Ah! if others had been like thee, honest Andrew, tailor, our story would have had a less tragical end. Huss, himself, seems to have had some forbodings of what the issue might be, still his resolution to appear at the Council was unmoved. He arranged all his worldly affairs, before leaving Prague, and wrote several farewell letters which are full of interest, as exhibiting a maturing piety and spirituality, as he drew nearer and nearer to the martyr’s sufferings, and the martyr’s crown. In one of these, written to a friend, he entreats him, in an endorsement thereon, not to open it, till he should have certain news of his death. In this letter he laments the time he had wasted, and the irritation of temper which he at times had manifested in playing chess, and how he had been led by custom, and a spirit of pride, to indulge in needless superfluities of food and dress; and adds: “Thou knowest my doctrine, for thou hast received my instructions from thy youth; I need, therefore, to write no further. But I entreat thee, by the mercy of the Lord, not to imitate me in any of the vanities into which thou hast seen me fall.” There is another letter, written at the same time, to his beloved flock, in terms which showed how much he had at heart their spiritual well-being. He entreated them to be firm in the faith and doctrine which he had taught them; prayed that God would bestow upon him the Holy Spirit, so that he might be established in the truth, and meet with fortitude, temptations, prison, and if need be, a cruel death; and begged them also to pray that he might either glorify God, by a speedy and unflinching martyrdom, or return to Prague without a stain, that is, he adds, “that I may not suppress one tittle of the Gospel.”*

* Dowling’s History of Romanism, p. 399.

In October, 1414, Huss bade adieu to his chapel of Bethlehem, which he was no more to behold, to his scholars and friends; and went on to his crown of martyrdom, attended by a noble and generous friend, a knight, named John of Chlum, and two or three others, who were strongly attached to him.

As he journeyed along, he was received everywhere with enthusiasm. He travelled in the ordinary dress of a priest; and in every town through which he passed, he gave notice that he was ready to answer questions, and explain his views. Parish priests, generally received him kindly, and in one or two places, came to him with a goblet of wine, to drink his health, and wish him God speed; and as the priests who did this meant well, though the proceeding was a little unclerical, Huss was not too severely critical, and returned thanks for the civility. At length he arrived at Constance, on the 3d of November, six days after Pope John—to whom this Council brought no great advantage. On the succeeding day, he gave notice of his arrival, to the Pope, through his friend John de Chlum. The Pope who did not feel the ground very secure under his own feet,* was cautious about exercising his full Papal domination, and welcomed our reformer, with a fraternal greeting. His strong language was: "If John Huss had killed my own brother, I would hinder with all my power, the least injustice to him, during his stay in Constance." He even took off the ban of excommunication. For about four weeks after his arrival, nothing was said or done about him. At the expiration of that time, Paletz, his old teacher, and Professor of Divinity in the University of Prague, and Michael de Caussis, a parish priest in the same city arrived, and affairs soon began to wear a sinister aspect. Placards were posted on the churches, and through the city, in which Huss was reviled as an excommunicated heretic; a report was circulated that he was intending to escape, and every underhand method was used to prejudice the members of the Council against the Bohemian reformer. He was approached privately, and told if he would humble himself to the Pope and the archbishop, he would be permitted to leave. But this did not suit a man like John Huss. He was conscious of no fault. If fault could be proved, well and good; but he stood

* See Geiseler, §129, Note 15.

there a priest of the Church, believing none other things than those which were written in the law of God, and as such he appealed to the Council. It was not the object of his enemies, however, to give him the opportunity of appearing in public, and openly pleading his cause. They feared the acute and eloquent tongue of the bold champion of reform, and had no idea of risking the effect upon the "*Tristis et exhaustæ faciei, et languentis corporis*," which as the Jesuit Balbinus says, "*Omni lingua facundius perorabant*" of the Bohemian preacher. So in defiance of the safe-conduct of the Emperor, and the fair words of the Pope, Huss was arrested on the 28th of November, as a heretic, imprisoned first in the Cathedral, and a week after, transferred to a convent of Dominican friars, on an island in the beautiful Lake of Constance.

In vain did the Count de Chlum, grieved and incensed at the arrest and imprisonment of Huss, appeal to Sigismund, although, that prince, did at first show some indignation, at the breach of his safe-conduct; in vain did the nobles of Bohemia, once and again intercede with the Emperor, urging that his own honor, and that of his throne, were indissolubly connected with the full observance of his promise; in vain were the three letters of the Bohemian nation to the Council, appealing to the Emperor's safe-conduct, and complaining of the representation that all Bohemia was a heretic country.* Cardinals, and such like, care but little for all that, when the interests of their craft are imperriled. The only answer given to all this interference of his friends, was that Huss was thrown, heavily ironed, into a noisome dungeon, in the castle of Gottleben, on the banks of the Rhine. His indignant friend De Chlum, now posted up a proclamation, in the name of the Emperor, declaring that the Pope had been false to his promise, and that the dishonor done to the imperial authority, was no less than the injury done to Huss; but, alas! he might as well have saved himself the trouble, for Sigismund, like Wenceslaus, yielded to reasons of State policy, and the influence of the creatures who had his ear.

And so for weary months, Huss dragged out an existence in his noisome cell. No efforts were spared by his enemies, to destroy him. His private letters were opened,

* See Geiseler, §149, Note 25.

others were forged in his name, and presented to the Council; his appeals to the Emperor disregarded; and his quondam friend, Paletz, visited him in prison, with a view to get him to commit himself by some unguarded word, and use it against him. All he got out of him was this, "Sad greeting do you give me, and sadly do you sin against your own soul: look at me—a poor worn prisoner—perhaps I am to die here; or should I recover my health, to be burned. What return will you get for all this in Bohemia?" Then an accusation in eight articles against him were drawn up by Michael de Caussis, and three commissioners appointed by the Pope, to visit him in prison, question him, take down his answers, and report to a council of Doctors. He was not even allowed the assistance of counsel, which he requested.

Still, John Huss, lay in prison. In the day time he was chained to a staple in the floor of his cell; and at night, chained to his bed. His friends were not permitted to see him; and he became the victim of fresh and painful diseases. By this time Pope John, dreading the results of the investigations, which the Council had begun, regarding his own conduct, had fled in disgrace to Schafhausen,* and soon after,† was disposed by the solemn sentence of that body, "*Tanquam indignum, inutilem, et damnosum a papatu, &c., amovendum privandum et deponendum fore.*" And so the same sacred Council removes, deprives and deposes him, declaring at the same time, that all and every Christian, of whatever station, rank or condition, is absolved from all obedience, allegiance or oath to him.‡ But the flight and deposition of the Pope, instead of relieving Huss, only aggravated his sufferings; for he was left for whole days without food.

A day was fixed, at last, for his appearance before the Council. That day was June 5th, 1415. A few days before he was removed from his prison to a Franciscan convent in Constance, where the Council assembled to investigate his affairs. On this occasion, the famous de Gerson, who had been an unrelenting opponent of Pope John, drew up nineteen Articles against Huss, from his treatise "De Ecclesia," which he pronounced heretical, and as such deserving judicial condemnation. The Count De Chlum

* 21st of March.

† 29th of May.

‡ *Vide* Geiseler; § 130, Note 9.

and his secretary, both sent word to Sigismund that the crisis of Huss' fate was now at hand, and that, at least, he ought to have a fair trial. To this the Emperor assented, at least in words, and even went so far as to send down some commissioners to watch the progress of affairs, but this was all; for when the cardinals and bishops burned the written statement which Huss gave of his opinions, and which was intended for the eye of the Emperor, the latter made no inquiries on the subject. When the first article of accusation was read, and Huss asked, If he acknowledged *that* to be his opinion? He said, "Yes," and as he proceeded to prove it from Scripture, he was assailed by such a storm of outcries, insults and taunts from cardinals, right reverends and canons, that the session broke up in confusion, and the hearing had to be postponed till another day. The 7th of June was then appointed, when the trial was to be resumed in the presence of the Emperor. On the intervening day, Huss put forth a declaration, in which he affirmed that he could not declare that the articles in his writings were false, but he should condemn the teachings of Holy Scripture, and of such men as St. Augustine, that if he abjured them, he would be guilty of perjury. So he was brought a second time before the Council. On the 7th of June, he was questioned in presence of the Emperor, on the following points: Whether he denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation—taught and defended in Bohemia the doctrines of Wycliffe—asserted that popes or priests, leading sinful lives, could neither consecrate nor baptize—said that he would appeal from the Pope to Christ, and wished when he died his soul to be, where Wycliffe's is? Another point in his accusation was, that he had counseled the people to violent and aggressive measures, quoting Moses as an example; that he had been the means of stirring up strife between the civil and ecclesiastical powers; that he had broken up the University of Prague, and boasted that neither the King nor Emperor could have forced him to come to Constance, if he had not chosen to come. Some of these charges he frankly admitted, others he denied.*

On the next day, Huss stood once more before the Council, when no less than thirty-nine articles, extracted

* Gieseler, §149. Note 26.

from his treatises *De Ecclesia contra Steph. Paletz*, and *contra Stanislaum*, were presented and read, touching various points of his teaching concerning the Church, its doctrines, officers and sacraments, such as predestination, the treatment of heretics, the power of the clergy, the rightfulness of excommunication, and the possibility of the Church being governed without a pope. In answer to the cry for him to retract, he uniformly replied that he could not retract what he had never said, and would not retract what he had said, until it was proved to be erroneous. Thus this early champion of reform in the Church, stood almost alone, a worn-out, sickly prisoner, against the combined learning and power of the world; and yet wiser and stronger than they all. Wiser, because his was the wisdom that cometh from above; stronger, because he upheld the truth, and they upheld a lie—because his “prove me to be in the wrong,” was the watchword of a cause, sure, in the long run, to be triumphant; and their clamor was the bluster with which a coward ever seeks to cover his defeat! All that the industry of wily and malignant enemies could collect, was brought to bear against him. His sayings and his writings were skilfully garbled and dressed up to suit the purposes of his prosecutors. When he asked for arguments, the only answer was, “Abjure!” The threats and entreaties of the Emperor were as powerless to move him, as the subtleties and clamors of the Doctors. The Emperor, no great theologian to be sure, told him he must needs be wrong, when so many learned men were against him. Some tried to cajole him, by holding out abundant promises of favor, if he would consent to recant; some threatened, some talked the jargon of the schools, even the cardinal-bishop of Ostia, drew up an ingenious and moderate form of recantation, to enable him to overcome his scruples, and still he faced every assailant and fenced with every disputant, but no influences could make him move an inch. Even his staunch supporter, Count de Chlum, besought him with tears, to retract something, if he possibly could, that so he might be saved. “I am an unlearned man,” said the honest nobleman, “but I beseech thee, dear Master John, if you are conscious of any little error, acknowledge it to the Council;” “but,” he added, “if you are not conscious of any, God forbid that I should lead you to the false step of doing anything against your conscience!” Huss replied:

"May God reward you, good friend; and I call him to witness, that from my heart I am ready, whenever the Council teaches me anything better from Holy Scripture, to change my opinion at once—till then I am as immovable as a rock!" Brave and honest avowal, and it was taken as his final decision.

Degradation and Martyrdom of Huss.

We must hasten on to the final catastrophe. On the 24th of June, the Council ordered all his writings to be publicly burned. On July 1st, the Council sent a new deputation to try to get him to recant; and a few days after, another came from the Emperor; both were listened to with great respect, but failed to move him from his position.

On the 6th of July, Huss was brought once more before the Council, but not this time to undergo the mockery of a trial. He was there to hear his sentence pronounced. The place of assembly was densely crowded. The Emperor, and all the princes of the empire, were present. A fierce and sanguinary discourse was delivered by the bishop of Lode, from the text, "That the body of sin might be destroyed," Rom. 6:6. How much the spirit of Christ, or the Apostle it contained, may be inferred from the peroration. Turning to the Emperor, he addressed him thus: "Destroy in your dominions, errors and heresies," and, pointing to Huss, "above all this obstinate heretic. A holy work, noble prince, is here given, to be accomplished by you, in whose hands God has placed the sword of justice," and more to the same effect. The thirty-nine articles, were then read, together, with the decree, which condemned his writings to the flames, and, finally, the sentence against himself, by which he was to be degraded from the priesthood, and delivered over to the secular power to be punished. He appealed from that sentence, but not to the Council or Emperor. His appeal was to a higher court; with his hands raised together, to heaven, he cried with a loud voice, "Behold, O, blessed Christ, how this Council condemns both thy teaching, and thy works—I appeal once more to Thee, who didst deliver up thy cause, into the hands of God, thy Father, leaving us the example, that we, when ill treated by thine enemies, might ourselves, have recourse to the judgment of God, the most righteous Judge!" When the sentence

was concluded, Huss said again, "I came here of my own free will, to appear before this Council, relying upon the *safe-conduct, and solemn pledge of the Emperor, here present.*" As he uttered these words, with his eye looking steadfastly on the prince, we are not surprised, to be told that a burning blush suffused the imperial countenance. This shameful conduct of Sigismund, was not lost as a lesson to his successor, Charles V., when a century later, he was urged by the worthy successors of the assembly, at Constance, to have Luther arrested at Worms, notwithstanding, the safe-conduct, Charles had given him; "No," said he, "I should not like to blush like Sigismund."

The preliminaries of the sentence were now carried out. Rome generally adds insult to injury, in such matters, and the present case, was no exception. The ceremony of degradation, was first to be performed. Huss was dressed in full priestly costume—a paten was put into one hand, and a chalice into the other, as if he was about to celebrate mass. Thus arrayed, the officiating bishop, again exhorted him to abjure; but turning to the people, he declared that he should not act so as to be a stone of stumbling, to the weakest believer, by a hypocritical recantation. One by one, the vestments were taken from him; and the expression used, when the chalice was snatched from him, may serve as a sample of the rest—"Accursed Judas, we take from thee this cup, filled with the blood of Jesus Christ!" "But," replied the martyr, "I trust in God, the Father, and my Lord Jesus Christ, for whose name I bear all this, that he will not take from me the cup of salvation; and I have a good hope, that I shall drink of it to-day in his Kingdom." When the marks of the tonsure were to be effaced, a dispute arose amongst them, about the instrument to be used. It was, at last, got rid of, somewhat after the Indian fashion, and on his head was set a pyramid shaped cap, painted over with frightful figures of demons, (members of the Council, might have sat for the portraits,) and bearing the inscription, "Arch-Heretic." Thus arrayed, the prelates devoted his soul to the devils: "*Animam tuam diaboli condemnamus.*" But all this satanic acting, moved not his faith. Greater was He that was with him, than all that could be against him. "I wear joyfully"—he cried aloud, "this crown of shame," for the love of Him who bore a crown of thorns."

By the order of the Emperor, John Huss, now in the

hands of the secular power, was given over to the chief magistrate of Constance, who at once abandoned him to the executioners. As he passed the gate, he saw his books in flames, burning only a little before himself. On arriving at the place of execution, he kneeled down and prayed fervently for grace and strength to be given him, to bear the trial without flinching. Not a wavering word escaped his lips. When the faggots were piled round him, and he chained to the stake, he said, "I willingly wear these chains for Christ's sake, who bore more grievous ones for me." The people who had looked on, were moved with pity, and once when he wished to address them, in their native tongue, he was brutally silenced, and the order given to light the faggots forthwith. Then the fire was put to the wood, and a dense smoke, almost shut out the martyr, from the eyes of his murderers. Soon after, the smoke cleared away, and a strong, bright flame surrounded the dying Christian, as with a robe of light—his lips were seen to move once, as if with the prayer that he had again and again uttered, as the end drew near. "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and all was over. That brave, truth-loving spirit, was taken away to a land, where lies and cruelty, and the whole array of Satan's plots, and Satan's instruments, have no place, for evermore.

The ashes were carefully gathered up, and thrown into the river Rhine. The priests were successful in obliterating all traces of the event, from before the eyes of men. But the seed was sown, which did produce a plentiful crop—confessors and martyrs, in abundance, caught up the standard, as it fell from the dying hands of John Huss, and bore it on to victory. Nor, will our review, of the patience and fortitude of this one, of the world's noblest men, be altogether devoid of fruit for us, if after his example, and that of others like him, armed with the Word of God, we be bold for the truth, and zealous to do the work that God has set before us.

"Lives of great men all remind us,
We can make our lives sublime;
And departing, leave behind us,
Footprints on the sands of time."

ARTICLE II.

HISTORY OF THE CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES
IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. TRANSLATED FROM
THE FRENCH.*

By Prof. L. W. HEYDENREICH, A. M., Bethlehem, Pa.

*Chapter I. Use of the Old Testament, in the Apostolic
Church.*

At the epoch of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, the sacred books of the Old Testament, were used for the edification of the Jewish congregations, by means of regular readings in the synagogues, on festivals, and generally in prayer meetings. The origin of this custom is not known. Relying on what is related in the thirty-first chapter of Deuteronomy, † the Talmudic tradition traces it back to Moses; but in the whole history of the Israelites, previous to the exile, there is no vestige, either of the existence of the synagogues, or of reading of the kind indicated. The first allusion, to such facts, are found only in the literature subsequent to the exile, ‡ and that whole arrangement, appears to have been the fruit, and at the

* The above is a translation of the first two chapters of "*Histoire du Canon des Saints—Ecritures de l'Eglise chretienne* par Edward Reuss, Professor in the Protestant Faculty and Seminary of Strasburg." Notwithstanding, the very limited number of readers which such a book finds in France, a second edition became necessary, a few months after its first publication. It treats the same subject as "*Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments* von Ed. Reuss, which has been so highly appreciated in Germany, that a 4th edition was issued in 1864, and is used as a text book in the University of Halle. Several persons having expressed a wish for a French translation of this book, Prof. Reuss, believing that neither the form nor the method would satisfy French readers, resolved to present the same subject in a different and more acceptable form, to his French countrymen. Satisfied that a translation of the French work will meet with a more favorable reception from the English readers than that of the German, the above is given as a specimen of this highly interesting and valuable work.

† Compare also Joseph. C. Apion II, 173 *ἐκείνης εβδομάδος ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν τοῦ νόμου ἐκίλευεν (ὁ νομοθέτης) συλλέγεσθαι.*

‡ Neh. 8. The fact related 2 Kings 22, has a quite different bearing.

same time, one of the most powerful means of the ecclesiastical and national restoration, by which Judaism commenced its definitive consolidation.* At the time of the apostles, it was already an old custom,† established wherever there was a synagogue, and especially connected with the local or Sabbatical worship.

It is natural to suppose that originally, the only subject of these readings was the Mosaic Law; this is also the opinion of some Jewish doctors, who refer the custom of reading passages drawn from the Prophets to the epoch of the persecutions of king Antiochus, during which the Jews may have been deprived of all the copies of the Pentateuch. This explanation, indeed, appears to us scarcely probable. The high consideration, which the second volume of the Scriptures enjoyed, could not fail to assign to it soon a place, analogous to that which had been reserved to the first only; but that the use of the prophets is of a later date, seems to us to follow from the fact, that only pieces, selected from the different books of the collection, were read, while the whole law was read connectedly. In Palestine, the text of the Pentateuch was formerly divided into one hundred and fifty-three Sedarim (series) corresponding to the Sabbaths of three consecutive years: later, in the synagogues of Babylon, the division into fifty-four Parashes (sections), calculated for a single year, was adopted. This last division, finally prevailed, and is indicated to-day in all editions of the Hebrew Bible. As for the Prophets, it is necessary, first, to remember that the Jews comprehended under this collective name, not only the fifteen, properly called prophetical, books (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel ‡ and the Twelve), but, moreover, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. Already before the apostolic epoch, the religious exercises were usually closed by the reading of a passage, taken from one of these books; these were incoherent and isolated fragments, true pericopes (or lessons), as they were called later in the Christian Church. Such a combination was subject to

* *Histoire de la theologie chretienne au Siecle apostolique* par Ed. Reuss. B. I., Chap. 2, 3.

† Act 15 : 21, ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων — κατὰ πόλιν — ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ τῶν σάββατον.

‡ It is known that the Hebrew Bible assigns to the book of Daniel no place among the prophetical books (Nebiim) but among the Hagiographa (Chetubim).

many variations, and, in fact, the information, though not extensive, which we possess on these matters, seems to prove successive changes in the usages. In any case, the Haftares (final lessons) recorded to-day, in the printed Hebrew texts, seem not to date back farther than the middle ages.

However, the New Testament attests already the custom of this general reading. Indeed, all the passages which may be quoted as such a testimony, are not equally explicit. From what Luke relates about the preaching of Jesus Christ at Nazareth,* could, perhaps, be drawn the inference of a perfectly free choice of the text. The same author, in a passage already quoted,† and Paul too,‡ expressly mention only the books of Moses as being read in the synagogues. But in another,§ the Prophets in the plural number, are formally spoken of, and nothing prevents us from including Moses in the number; in the same chapter, a few lines preceding,|| the reading of the law and of the prophets is mentioned, in terms which do not permit us to doubt that a regular and official custom is meant. But, moreover, this same usage is attested more indisputably by the frequent use of the term *the Law and the Prophets*¶ whenever the Scriptures of the Old Testament are spoken of in general. These two parts only being used for the customary reading, they represented in the mind of the hearers the idea of the sacred code.

Such was the state of things at the death of Jesus, when his disciples commenced to attach themselves more intimately to one another, and to form congregations more and more numerous and distinct. It is not necessary to mention here, that those among the believers who belonged to the Jewish nation, did, for that reason, not discontinue to attend the synagogue, and that, consequently, the custom of the public reading of the Holy Scriptures remained familiar to them. Soon they introduced into their private meetings, even before the final separation from the Jews, the same means of edification that were used in the religious meetings of the latter, and later, when the schism

*Luke 4:16. †Acts 15:21. ‡2 Cor. 3:15. §Acts 13:27.

||V. 15: ἀνάγνωσις τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

¶Or well also *Moses and the prophets*, (Matth. 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; Luke 16:16, 29, 31; 24:27, 44; John 1:46; Acts 24:14; 28:23; Rom. 3:21).

was consummated, they preserved and bequeathed them to the following generations. We shall not stop to collect the passages which speak of prayers, singing and preaching. We shall confine ourselves to the public reading of the texts. There is, indeed, in the whole New Testament, but one single passage where this reading is mentioned.* Positive traces have been sought elsewhere in vain,† but we can succeed in proving the fact by very plausible inductions. First, it is unquestionable, that the Church read the Old Testament in the second century and later, and it is scarcely probable that she would have adopted this custom if the apostles had permitted it to fall into disuse. Then it may be seen, not only from the didactic books of the New Testament, but, moreover, from all that we know of the preaching of the first missionaries, that the evangelical instructions from the beginning rested very essentially upon the scriptural prophecies, and that the texts of Holy Writ were incessantly invoked, either to give to the facts of the evangelical history their religious and providential signification, or to legitimate the doctrines that were connected with it, especially when they were apparently in contradiction to the previous revelation, or when they jarred with the traditional beliefs. There is, also, scarcely a page in the New Testament, where the Old is not invoked with a dogmatical purpose, or which does not disclose that its authors were very familiar with its texts. But if that is incontestable in reference to the authors and preachers, the same must also be supposed to be the case with the readers and the hearers; unless we fancy the latter as entirely passive in the face of the great questions that arose before them.‡ Now, when we think of the utmost scarcity of the copies among private individuals; of the impossibility of the majority of the church members to procure and possess the whole of that large and precious library, we naturally infer that their knowledge of the Old Testament must have come from public readings; in most of the cases they were the only possible means, and in all cases they were the most direct and simple. The heathen or Jewish origin of the different members of the

* 1 Tim. 4 : 13.

† Acts 2 : 47; Eph. 5 : 19; Col. 3 : 16.

‡ See, on the contrary, Acts 17 : 11 ; 8 : 28 ; Gal. 4 : 21, etc

churches did not make any difference in this respect. All received the same apostolical instruction; moreover, many Greek proselytes had frequented the synagogues before being baptized; and the apostles, into whose mind never entered the thought of depreciating the importance of the Old Testament, or of doubting its divine origin, did not think of founding the faith of their heathen disciples on a basis different from that which sustained their own convictions.

But here some special questions present themselves, which are so much the more interesting as they will recur, so to say, throughout the history of the Christian Canon, and are still pending to-day.

It has been asked, for instance, what could have been the form and the number of the sacred books of the collection used in the century of the apostles. Was the Canon of the Old Testament closed, and was it such as we have it now in our Hebrew Bible? Or, has it not, perhaps, comprised other books besides? These questions have been answered in every possible way, without arriving at any positive conclusion. Here are, however, some facts, which should not be neglected in this discussion.

First and foremost, it is necessary not to forget that all the Christians could not use the Hebrew original. The old tongue of the prophets was no longer spoken; it differed from the usual language of the Palestine Jews as much as the English of Chaucer differs from that of the nineteenth century, and whoever had not received a literary education did not understand it. Therefore the reading of the texts was accompanied by an interpretation in the vulgar idiom. This interpretation was still more indispensable to those Jews who, residing either in the maritime cities of Palestine, or especially in foreign countries, had entirely forgotten the language of their fathers, even in its later forms, and had adopted the Greek, or what they believed to be the Greek. It cannot be proved that, in the first century of our era, the sacred texts were read in the synagogues of Palestine, in the Aramaic idiom, which unquestionably was the case at a later period; the interpretation was given orally. If this was necessary among the Aramaic Jews, whose language had a striking analogy with the Hebrew, it must be admitted that the oral interpretation of the Hebrew texts, in the vernacular idiom, was the more necessary among the Greek Jews.

For, although there existed already Greek translations, they were not used. We know that long afterwards, in the time of the emperor Justinian, there was still, among the Jews, opposition to the official use of them.* But what may have been the custom of the Christians? Did they submit to the exigencies of that linguistic orthodoxy? Or, had the great want of edification overcome among them the tenacity of the forms? We are ignorant of it. We know absolutely nothing of the destiny of the celebrated Greek translation of Alexandria, (called the Septuagint) previously to the epoch, when the Christian Church and theology made nearly an exclusive use of it.

This point of the history would be less dark, if the numerous quotations of passages of the Old Testament, inserted in the writings of the apostles, were such as to determine our judgment. But by the side of a series of texts positively borrowed from the Septuagint, and faithfully reproducing the peculiarities, the singular expressions, the different readings, or the exegetical mistakes, of this translation, there are quite as many where the Christian writers themselves seem to have translated the original in a quite independent manner, whether they agree with the Hebrew against the Alexandrian translators, or whether they adopt a translation equally distant from both texts. We shall not stop to prove these facts by the analysis of some passages particularly significant; that would divert us too much from our principal subject. We content ourself with laying down as facts, that the version of the Septuagint was known to the Christians, and consulted by them, as early as the first century; but that it did not enjoy an absolute or exclusive authority, as was the case later; that, on the contrary, it appears not even to have been made use of, wherever it could have been done with benefit. Upon the whole, we have no very clear idea of the manner in which the readings may have been conducted in the primitive Church, especially in countries where the Greek tongue was spoken. On the one hand we cannot affirm that in all the churches, copies of the Septuagint were already possessed and used. However, as on the other hand, the persons who would have understood the original well enough to be able to interpret it orally to Greek hearers, after having read it in Hebrew,

* Cod., 28. Nov. 146.

must have been extremely scarce outside of Palestine, it is very probable that Christians, at least, made use of a written Greek translation.

Now it is important to remember that the Hebrew and the Greek Bible did not resemble one another in every respect, even apart from the value of the translation. Every body knows that the latter contains several books which are foreign to the former, viz.: those of Judith, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus and the Maccabees. Were these books,—which, later, were designated in the Church by the name of Apocrypha of the Old Testament,—also in the hands of the Greek Christians of the first century and put, by them, on the same level as the others, inasmuch, at least, as they used the Septuagint? This question has been answered, sometimes in the affirmative, and sometimes in the negative. Some have maintained that even among the Greek Jews these books had no authority; others believed that they found in the New Testament numerous allusions to some of them. And undoubtedly parallels, sometimes very striking, may be drawn between the Epistle of James and Ecclesiasticus; between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Wisdom of Solomon, even between certain passages of St. Paul and the same works; but the circumstance that ideas already propagated in the society, or common to the thinkers of the same century, are reproduced in their writings, does not prove that their successors have directly borrowed them from their predecessors, nor, above all, that by adopting these ideas they have conceded to them a dogmatical authority. And this side of the question is the most essential. In the whole New Testament, not a single dogmatical passage, drawn from the Apocrypha, and quoted as coming from a sacred source, could be pointed out. Thus, whatever may have been the usage followed in the different Christian congregations, it must be said, that the apostolical instructions, as far as we are acquainted with them, adhered to the Hebrew Canon.

However, it would be wrong to exaggerate the bearing of this fact. We present here, a few considerations, which, in our opinion, prove that what to-day we call the question of the Canon, was not for the apostles and their immediate disciples, as it has been for the Protestant divines, an all important affair, nor an affair subordinate to a previous criticism and to a precise theory of inspiration.

First, if the silence of the authors of the New Testament, respecting the Greek books called Apocrypha, should prove by itself, that these books were not in the hands of the first Christians, were neither read nor consulted by them, this same argument could be used against certain writings of the Hebrew collection of which the New Testament does also not speak and whose authority it never invokes. Among these writings, there are not only historical books (Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther,) whose contents do furnish no material meet to the apostles, to use in their instructions, but, moreover, writings in which the traditional orthodoxy maintains, to find very positive and very detailed evangelical revelations, (Song of Solomon) or at least, texts to be used with an analogous view (Ecclesiastes). These books, had evidently, for the apostles no canonical value in the Christian sense of the word, *i. e.*, could not be used in the construction of the dogma of the new Covenant. This remark is not new, it was made, as we shall see hereafter, already in the sixteenth century, by Lutheran divines considered very orthodox. It acquires a particular importance, because it is connected with a question of a still greater bearing. Is it true that the Hebrew code, such as we possess, had already been closed at the times of the apostles? Nobody can prove it. On the contrary, we have elsewhere shown, that, at the epoch of the historian Josephus, the books called Hagiographa,* were not yet collected in a distinctly determined body, and that certain Hebrew pieces, which to-day form a part of it, appear even to have been unknown to this author. It has generally been attempted to prove the integrity of the Hebrew Canon, for the apostolical epoch by the terms which are used in Luke 24 : 44; but it is obvious that, in this passage, the Lord merely meant to enumerate the books in which the Messianic prophecies were found. It is impossible, that, for instance, Ezra and the Chronicles should also be comprised under the name of Psalms.

In the second place, if the apostles, in their writings, do not speak of certain canonical books of the Old Testament, there are, on the other hand, found in these

* Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nemeiah and Paralipomena (Chronicles).

same writings quotations, which prove that the notion of the Canon, such as theology has defined it later, was unknown to them. We will not here insist upon certain passages, which it has been impossible to find in the Hebrew texts, for instance, John 7 : 38 ; Luke 11 : 49 ; 1 Cor. 2 : 9 ; James 4 : 5 ; Matthew 2 : 23, etc., and, which, not only many modern interpreters, but already Origen and other Fathers believed to have been borrowed from apocryphal books, now lost ; for, after all, they may be considered as quotations made from memory, and for that very reason, more or less inaccurate. We shall insist more on facts quoted by them, with a didactic purpose, and which are positively drawn from uncanonical sources. What Saul says of Egyptian magicians* is not necessarily extracted from a book, but is, in any case, borrowed from a tradition, which may appear unreliable. The examples of courage, and of religious constancy, extolled by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews† are unquestionably copied, partly from the history of the Maccabees, and as he presents these latter, as having claims to the admiration of the faithful, equal to those of the heroes of sacred antiquity, so the documents, that narrate the life of both must have had an equal value in the eyes of the writer, who quotes them. The epistle of Jude,‡ reproduces not only traditional narratives quite peculiar, which might very well have been borrowed from works of an apocryphal nature, but it invokes even explicitly, and as an authority previous to the deluge, a book which we have still in our hands and which assuredly, no one could any longer consider as authentic, and divinely inspired.

From all this, it follows at least, that theories about the Canon, stated by Protestant theology, must not hastily be ascribed to the apostles. Soon we shall see among their disciples and immediate successors analogous facts. But that is not all. We have still to point out to our readers, a very remarkable peculiarity, too often neglected, and notwithstanding, of some importance to the history of the canon. Among the books of the Old Testament, there are several, the Greek text of which differs much from the Hebrew text, either by a new wording, or also, and above all, by additions made by foreign hands. Thus, in the

* 2 Tim. 3 : 8.

† Heb. 11 : 34 and following.

‡ Jude 9, 14.

book of Daniel, the Greek recension inserts the Song of the three holy children in the fiery furnace, and the stories Susanna of Bel and the Dragon. Thus the book of Jeremiah, has undergone not only a complete transformation, in the order of its contents and chapters, but there has been added, to it, an epistle of the prophet, and what is called the book of Baruch. The book of Esther has been enriched by a series of pretended official documents. Finally, that of Ezra, is found there twice in two very different wordings. Now, it is not only likely, but established by testimonies which we shall collect in proper time and place, that the Christians who used the Greek Bible, and who were not learned enough to compare it with the original, as did Origen and Jerome, were acquainted with, and read the books just spoken of, only in the form they had received in the Greek version, or as we would now say, in the apocryphal form. How far back can this fact be traced? We are no more able to determine exactly the epoch of the origin of these additions, but it is very possible that they existed before the Christian era. We have proved that the historian Josephus knows only the Greek recension of several of the books in question. We shall see further that this is also the case with nearly all the Fathers of the Church.

After having established that the history of the canon of the Scriptures, in the apostolic century, is not so simple and clear as it is generally believed; nor so consonant with the ideas commonly received, we shall still add a few words in reference to the theological bearing of the question. There is not the least doubt, that the apostles and Christians, generally of their time, considered the law and the prophets as divinely inspired,* and consequently, the words of the Scriptures, not as the words of men, but as the words of God. It is the spirit of God that speaks through the mouth of sacred authors,† and the prophets, while writing, are in a quite peculiar and extraordinary mental state, which excludes the idea of a gross and human error.‡ In this respect, the king, David, considered as

* We refer for this whole question to *l'Histoire de la théologie chrétienne*, V. I., p. 296, (2nd ed. p. 411).

† Acts 1 : 16, 3 : 18, 21 ; Heb. 3 : 7, 4 : 7, 9 : 8, etc.

‡ *ἐν πνεύματι* (Matthew 22 : 43).

the author of all the Psalms,* shared the privilege of the prophets,† and in consequence, the honor of the liturgical use which the synagogue made of his sacred songs; the book, of which he was considered the author, partook of the honors rendered to the two parts of Scripture, which were used in the public readings‡. But it is especially by the study of the exegetical methods, nearly common to the Jewish doctors and the apostles, that we are convinced that the notion of inspiration comprehended from this time all the elements of excellency, and absoluteness, which the definitions given later have always acknowledged. Indeed, it is only from this stand-point, that we can understand, how so many texts relating to a by-gone past, simple narratives, songs expressing the joys or the regrets, either of an individual, or of a nation, in a peculiar situation; could incessantly, and most confidently, be interpreted as positive and special predictions, calculated to engross the speculative spirit of the schools, or to nourish and exalt the religious feelings of the masses. When we see that interpretation, essentially divin, applied to clauses detached from the contents, to words entirely disconnected, we must conclude that the proceeding, which, in our day, we would not dare to apply to any work, either sacred or profane, rests precisely on the then current notion of inspiration, which was not considered as restricted to a general direction of the spirit of the authors, but as positively implying the idea of a dictation of the words. Otherwise it would be necessary to charge with mere arbitrariness, the exegesis of the apostles, as it presents itself in numerous examples in the face of which the science of our day, stands in great embarrassment.

Thus two facts are duly established; on the one hand, a theory of inspiration which should not allow any confusion between sacred and profane literature; on the other hand, a practice which betrays a relative uncertainty, a certain vagueness, in the boundaries of the two kinds of literature, or at least, what is perhaps more correct, the absence of a decision, which would previously and definitely have strictly circumscribed the canonic code, and enumerated the writings, which it should contain. In other words, in the choice of the books which were to

* Acts 4 : 29 ; Heb. 4 : 7.

† Acts 2 : 30 and II. cc.

‡ Luke 24 : 44.

compose the Scriptures, now a theological or dogmatical stand-point could be taken, according to which one must have felt disposed to restrict their number—now a practical or pedagogical stand-point, according to which, far from proceeding with that exclusive severity, one was rather inclined to extend the circle of writings having religious value. We shall see that the whole history of the Canon, in the Christian Church amounts finally to the alternate preponderance of these two stand-points.

Chapter II. The Writings of the Apostles in the Primitive Church.

All that we have as yet said, concerns only the Old Testament, and relates to the usages introduced into the Church, in consequence of her natural relations to the synagogue. If we have not yet spoken of the writings of the apostles, it is because we are able to assert that these writings, during the whole remainder of the first century, and during at least, the first third of the second, were not yet the subject of an official, repeated, and to say liturgical reading, similar to that which, in our opinion, was given of the books of the prophets. We shall endeavor to prove this averment in this second chapter, in which we shall relate in general terms what were, during the indicated period, the portions of the books which, later, formed the New Testament.

The first thing which we have here to examine, is the mode of spreading these books. For, in presence of the restricted means of publicity, which could be used during the apostolic century, we would be wrong to suppose that the apostles had nothing to do, but to send off copies to all the existing Churches, and, nevertheless, those do it unwittingly, who maintain that the Canon, that is to say, the official collection, must have been formed everywhere, and simultaneously, as the texts were composed.

According to their origin, and the form of their publication, the apostolic books may be divided into two categories. First, those which primitively were addressed to particular congregations, and which, thus, from the beginning, had a public character, that invested them with authority, and facilitated their extensive circulation. In this category, we naturally place the nine principal epistles of Paul; but we unhesitatingly add to them the three

epistles to Timothy and Titus, whose authenticity, we have elsewhere defended; for their contents were such that the disciples who received them, were directly interested to secure to them a greater publicity; the epistle to Philemon, in spite of its shortness, and individual aim, was undoubtedly protected by the vicinity of that to the Colossians, among whom this friend of the author ranked high. If, as most of the critics think, the epistle to the Hebrews is written for a particular Church, (which, in any case, would not be that of Jerusalem), we should also have to mention it here. Now, we see clearly, from the texts which we can consult, how things happened in regard to these epistles. Generally, they reached their destination, by a more or less accidental opportunity.* Sometimes, even such an opportunity suggested the idea of writing. They were addressed, or delivered to the heads of the congregation, who, for this reason, were charged with the general and individual greetings,† and who read them in the meetings, which was so natural, that the apostle speaks of it explicitly but once, in the oldest epistle which we possess of him‡. The same persons had to communicate these letters to other neighboring congregations, when the apostle desired it. Thus the epistle to the Galatians must have been put into circulation after its arrival in one Church of the province; for, if there had been but a single Church in Galatia, it would be incomprehensible, why it should nowhere be designated, by the name of the place where it was located. Thus, the epistle to the Colossians, must have been communicated at least to another Church, if not to several§. Thus again, the epistle to the Corinthians, the second, in any case,|| are encyclical, and everybody knows that according to many interpreters, the same may be said of the epistle to the Ephesians. These communications could have been made in several ways, either by the transmission of the original, or by copies; in the first case, it is very probable, that each Church that received an epistle of this kind, took care to have it transcribed, before parting with the document. For all these

* Rom. 16 : 1 ; 1 Cor. 16 : 17 ; 2 Cor. 8 : 18 ff. ; Eph. 6 : 24 ff. ; Col 4 : 7 ; Titus 3 : 13.

† These greetings are always introduced by the exhortative recommendation : ἀσπάζεσθε.

‡ 1 Thes. 5 : 27.

§ Col. 4 : 16 ; comp. 2 : 1.

|| 1 Cor. 1 : 2 ; 2 Cor. 1 : 1.

Churches, having had personal and often very intimate relations with the author of the communicated writing, had an equal interest to preserve it, as a token of affection, as a precious evidence of a connection which continued to live in their memory, and was a source of happiness, to the first generation, and of glory to the second, and the following. There is no trace in the literature of this epoch, that these epistles were read publicly, on stated days, soon after their reception. The circumstance, that they are partly consecrated to momentary interests, renders this even not probable. Some time elapsed before they were regularly resumed; and still much later, when they were already spread far and wide, among the Christians, there exists no proof, that they were used for liturgical and periodical readings.

Moreover, to justify what we have just said, we are not reduced to simple assertions, or to more or less plausible inductions. The few works or fragments, which are still extant, of the literature, of the half century which followed that of the apostles, contain, in this respect, more direct information. But, before gathering it, and in order not to repeat ourselves, let us say a word more of the second category of the apostolical writings. We will speak of those which were designed for a less restricted circle of readers, for instance, the gospels, and a few of the epistles called *Catholic*. We include in this category, also the two books of Luke, although, they be apparently addressed to a single individual; for, at that epoch, the dedication was a literary proceeding which favored, rather than restricted the circulation of a work. The superscriptions of Peter's first epistle, and of the Revelation, are also less of an epistolary, than of a dedicatory character. Besides, these books, nearly all more extensive than Paul's epistles, must have spread, as all the writings of the time did, in proportion to the interest, called forth, either by the authors, if their names were known, or above all, by their contents. So, we see that, in this respect, all of them were not placed in the same conditions, and had not the same chances of success. The work of Luke, indeed, the latest of the historical books, but also the most complete, made its way much more slowly than the others;* it was not without

* Papias knew only the first two gospels, and the quotations of the texts peculiar to Luke, are very scarce in the authors of the second century; in comparison with those taken from Matthew.

encountering serious difficulties, that the epistle of James succeeded in becoming known outside of the place of its publication. In general, the writings, of this second category, seem to have had to overcome more difficulties than Paul's epistles, which were wholly pastoral, and by that very fact, invested with an official character, and constituting a public property, while the other books were, to tell the truth, at least in the beginning, private property, in the hands of persons who had obtained them in some way or other. This is so true, that for the whole period with which we are now occupied, we do not find a single statement, that they were used publicly, and scarcely any trace even of their existence, although we do not intend to call it into question. However, the spreading of all these writings, was not regulated, organized or directed by the care, or the action of a central power, which no longer existed, since the destruction of Jerusalem, and which, if it had previously existed, for a few years, did positively not control the religious movement, which already reached the heathen world, before Paul wrote his first epistle. We admit as little, that it was commercial speculation, what now we would call book trade, which undertook to spread the earliest literature of Christianity. The great majority of the Christians, belonged to the lower classes, which did not read. The gospel was still spreading, or rather never ceased to spread, and to be established by means of oral instruction. The want of replacing this, by a means less simple, and less easy to procure, could not make itself felt, since the apostles and their successors were incessantly visiting the Churches,* and since, everywhere, even in the smaller congregations, the traditional instruction was organized with much prudence, and so as to supply all wants.† The men chosen to direct the Churches, and to preserve unimpaired the sacred trust of the gospel, are recommended to the faithful, as sure guides, worthy of their submission and esteem.‡ The numerous terms by which the New Testament designates the instruction of

* Acts 8 : 14, 9 : 32, 11 : 22, 14 : 21, 15 : 29, 36, 41, 18 : 23, 20 : 1—17; 1 Cor. 4 : 17, 16 : 10—12; 2 Cor. 7 : 6 and following, 8 : 6, 12 : 18; 2 : 12 ff.; Col. 4 : 10; 1 Thess. 3 : 2; 2 Tim. 4 : 10; Titus 3 : 12.

† Acts 20 : 17, 28; Titus 1 : 9, 7; Eph. 4 : 11; 1 Peter 2 : 25; Phil. 1 : 1; 1 Cor. 12 : 8, 14, etc.

‡ 1 Cor. 16 : 15; Phil. 2 : 29; Col. 1 : 7; 1 Thess. 5 : 12. Clem. ad Corr., 1 : 42. Ignat. ad Philad. 7. Magnes, 8 : 13.

the apostles, express without exception the idea of an instruction imparted orally; everywhere we read of speaking and listening, of discourse and hearers, of preaching, proclamation and tradition,* and not a single time of writing and reading, unless there is an explicit allusion to the books of the Old Covenant. And later, when the writings of the first disciples and missionaries, were within the reach of the persons who had received a literary education, they would decidedly prefer the oral source, as furnishing a more complete knowledge of the evangelical facts†. At least, in acknowledging the great value of the apostolic documents, they did not forget that the penning of these few pages, exerted only a very secondary influence upon the great work of the evangelization of the world. "Guided by the Holy Ghost, and endowed with a miraculous power, the apostles everywhere preached the kingdom of God, caring very little about wording this message, because they had a more exalted mission to fill, which exceeded the power of a man. Paul, the first among them, both by the power of his eloquence, and the loftiness of his ideas, has left but a small number of very short epistles, although he could have written much more of what God had vouchsafed to reveal to him alone. The other companions of the Lord, the twelve apostles, the seventy disciples, were not less informed, and, nevertheless, only two from among them composed memoirs, because they were forced by circumstances."†

But if half a century after the destruction of Jerusalem,

* *Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐναγγελιστής, ἐναγγέλειται*, Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 4:19, etc.; Luke 9:6; Acts 8:4, etc.; 2 Tim. 4:9. *Κήρυγμα, κήρυξ, κηρύσσειν*, Titus 1:9; 1 Cor. 2:4; 2 Tim. 1:2; Matth. 10:7; Acts 20:23.—*Παράδοσις, παραδίδοναι*, 2 Thess. 2:19; Luke 1:2; Acts 16:4.—*Μαρτυρία, μαρτυρεῖν, μάρτυς*, Acts 1:8; 22:18; 23:11; Apoc. 1:9; 1 Cor. 15:19, etc.—*Ἀνοιξίς τοῦ στόματος*, Eph. 6:19.—*Λόγος*, Acts 14:17; James 1:22, etc.—*Λόγοεικός*; 1 Thess. 2:13; Heb. 4:2.—*Λαλεῖν*, Acts 18:19; Titus 2:19.—*Ἀκούειν*, Eph. 1:13; 1 John 2:7, etc.—*Ἀκροάσθαι*, James 1:22, etc. Compare, especially, Rom. 10:14—17; 2 Tim. 2:1, 2; Gal. 3:2, 9; Heb. 2:1—4.

† Papias, ap. Enset. 3:39: Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσούτον με ὠφελίῃ ἐπελάμβανον ὅσα τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης. This testimony is so much the more interesting, as the author declares to know two manuscripts of the life of the Lord, the one of Matthew, written in Hebrew, and the other of Mark (towards the year 126).

‡ Enseb. Hist. eccles. 3:24.

and the death of most of the first disciples of Jesus Christ, the writings of the latter were not regularly and periodically used for common edification, in the meetings of the congregations, it is not because they were forgotten, or not duly respected. On the contrary, the incessant intercourse which the Churches, especially those of Greece, and of Greek Asia, maintained, soon led to the exchange of the writings of *eminent Christians*, which each one possessed. We purposely say of *eminent Christians*, for we do not restrict this remark to the apostles alone. The disciples of the apostles, and their Churches, carried on the correspondence, as Paul first had given the example; and even if all the epistles ascribed to the Fathers called apostolical,* that is to say, to the writers which have flourished between the years 90 and 130, should not be authentic, which is very likely, they are none the less of a remote antiquity, and, in any case, they can serve as testimonies. So then Clemens, of Rome would have written to the Corinthians, Polycarp of Smyrna, to the Philippians, Ignatius of Antioch, to Churches more or less numerous, especially in proconsular Asia. These letters were far from being the only ones of their time. Now, we draw from them some information for our history of the Canon.

First, these letters establish the fact of the exchange of which we have just been speaking. Thus, Polycarp, writes to the Philippians, at the end of his epistle.† "I have received letters from you, and from Ignatius. You recommend me to forward yours into Syria; I shall perform your request, either personally or by some medium. In return, I send you Ignatius' letter, as well as others which I have in my hands, and which you asked of me.

* This expression is generally taken as designating men who personally knew the apostles. This interpretation is erroneous, if the origin of the term is taken into consideration, and, moreover, it cannot apply to all the writers, called *apostolic Fathers*. The qualification of ἀποστολικός occurs for the first time in the Martyrology of Saint Polycarp, c. 16; but as it is there joined to προφητικός, it is obvious that it does contain no chronological idea. The point, in question, is the religious tie which united the bishops of Smyrna, to the apostles, and the gift of prophecy which he possessed (ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἡμῶς χρόνοις διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς γινόμενος.)

† Solyc. ad Phil. c. 13; comp. Euseb. 3: 36, 37. We quote this text and others besides, without examining its authenticity, which is quite doubtful. The consequences which may be drawn from it lose nothing of their value, even if these texts are of a more recent date.

I enclose them. They will serve to edify your faith and perseverance." We do not know of which letters the author speaks in this passage. If they were apostolical writers, then the Philippians did not yet possess them all; if they were later works, then the Churches at this epoch used for their edification other writings besides those of the apostles. One thing is certain, that this epistolary intercourse continued still later.*

In the second place, these same epistles, give us the direct proof, that the writings of the apostles had not only passed the narrow circle of their first origin, or local destination, but that they exerted already a marked influence even on the instruction. Save some rare exceptions, the consideration of which we shall presently resume, we discover, indeed, as yet, in these epistles, no quotations of names, and the texts of the apostles, are nowhere expressly and literally invoked as authorities. But they are sometimes tacitly used, so that a mistake is impossible; in certain places, the exhortations assume the formulas employed by these illustrious predecessors, and, the conviction is forced upon us, that the writers of this second generation already studied those of the first. Thus, the letter of Clemens presents quite distinct recollections of some passages of the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, and especially of that to the Hebrews,† the letters of Ignatius, more numerous, and in any case, much more recent, present others, which are taken from the epistles to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians, and from the gospel of John;‡ finally, Polycarp's very small epistle contains frequent allusions to apostolical passages, particularly to the Acts, to the first epistle to Peter, to the first epistle to John, to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and to the first of Timothy.§ We repeat it, this use is merely homiletical or rhetorical; nowhere the name of an apostle, a quotation, a formula, any intimation whatever, informs the reader that the words, which we immediately recognize as borrowed elements, have a par-

* Euseb. 4 : 23, 5 : 25.

† Clem. ad Cor. 1 : 24, 32—36.

‡ Ign. ad Magnes. c. 10; ad Ephes. c. 18; ad Rom. c. 3 : 7; ad Philad. c. 1; ad Smyrn. c. 6, etc.

§ These allusions are more precise in the part of the epistle, the Greek text of which is lost. We suspect with Daillé and other critics, the authenticity of this part.

ticular import, are invested with a greater authority than the words with which they are connected. ||

We have said that there exist some exceptions to this use. They are interesting in several respects. The three authors, which we are analyzing, mention by name certain epistles of Paul, while they write precisely to the churches which had received them. They speak of them as documents still belonging to these churches, as being their inheritance. They speak of them in order to bring them to their recollection, to exhort them to read them again and to meditate upon them. Such an exhortation was, consequently, still necessary. Thus Clemens says to the Corinthians, that the views formerly entertained by the apostle, on the subject of their dissensions, were analogous to his own.* Polycarp, to preach righteousness to the Philippians, avails himself of the example of the illustrious and blessed Paul, who had preceded him among them, as well with his preaching as with the letter which he wrote to them, and which may still be used for their edification, if they will study it.† Finally, Ignatius reminds the Ephesians‡ that they are Paul's colleagues, the chosen instrument of God, in whose steps he, also, intends to walk, and who, in his epistle, declares that he always prays for them.

Let us add, in order not to forget anything, that the same authors, also, sometimes mention the evangelical history and certain words of Jesus.§ In most cases, it is difficult to say, whether they have borrowed their information from a written source, or from oral tradition. In the first supposition, it would, at least, be necessary to admit that they quote from memory, for their quotations do not agree with our canonical texts. We shall cite a few examples. Ignatius relates that Jesus, after his resurrection, said to his disciples: "Take, touch me and see that I

|| This homiletical use traces its origin to a still earlier epoch. See, *l'Histoire de la théologie apostolique*, 2 p 580 (2 edit. p. 293), what we have said of passages borrowed by the epistle of Luke from the epistle of James, to the Romans and to the Ephesians.

* Clemens, loc. cit., c. 47: ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Τί ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν;

† Polyc. loc. cit., 3: ὅς καὶ ἀπὸν ὑμῖν ἔγραφεν ἐπιστολαῖς εἰς ἃς ἰὰν ἐγκύπτῃτε διηγήσεσθε διευδομεῖσθαι κ. τ. λ.

‡ Ign. ad Eph., c 12, cf. Paul ad Eph. 1 : 16.

§ See, for instance, Ign. ad Eph., c. 14, c. 19; ad Smyrna, c. 1; ad Polyc., 2; Polyc. ad Phil., 2; Clem. ad Cor., c. 16, etc.

am not a spirit without a body."* Clemens quotes the following words: "Be merciful, in order that you may obtain mercy; pardon that you may be pardoned; as you do, so you will be done to; as you give, so you will receive; as you judge, so you will be judged; as you will be meek, so they will be meek to you; with the same measure, with which you mete, it shall be measured to you."† A fact of the same kind, still more remarkable, occurs in the epistle ascribed to Barnabas, older, in our opinion, than those of which we have just spoken. When it treats of the Sabbath, it states that the Christians spend the eighth day in joy, because, on this day, Jesus rose from the dead, appeared to his disciples, and ascended to heaven.‡ Whoever wrote this phrase, was neither acquainted with the gospels of Matthew, Mark and John, nor with the Acts of the Apostles, or did not ascribe to them any authority. For none of these documents allows us to suppose that the resurrection, the appearance and the ascension of Jesus took place on the same day.§

By these extracts, which we could multiply, everybody will convince himself, that there has not yet arisen the question of textual quotations, of canonical gospels, exclusively consulted for the history of the Lord. But more than that. Instead of the Canonical texts which we would naturally expect to be quoted, we find others, to which the Church subsequently did not concede the same authority. Thus, we must point out the fact, that Clemens does not hesitate to invoke, by the side of the "blessed" Paul, the "blessed" Judith,|| thus placing on the same line, by an identical qualification, writings, which, from a theological stand-point, we are accustomed to keep separate. The reason of it is, that this stand-point, was not that of this author; his notion of the Canon was different from ours,

* Λάβετε, ἀγαπήσατε με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον (ad Smyrn., c. 3, compare Luke 24 : 39).

† Clem., loc. cit., 1 : 13; compare Luke 6 : 36, and following.

‡ Ep. Barn., c. 19 : ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν οὐδοῦν εἰς ὑπποσύνην ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς.

§ Compare, besides, the last phrase of chap. 7, cited as a word of Jesus Christ and foreign to our gospels. Another of the same kind, chap. 4.

|| Clem., loc. cit., c. 99. It is the first mention of the book of Judith with the ancient.

or rather there was at that time no precise notion of all the Canon. After that, we shall neither let pass unnoticed a quotation of the same writer, which is taken from the book of Wisdom of Solomon,* unquestionably an indirect quotation, that is to say, not preceded by a formula which distinguishes it from the remainder of the text, but perfectly similar, in this respect, to nearly all of those which are borrowed from the Epistles of the New Testament. Clemens had read the book of the Wisdom of Solomon as he had read certain Epistles; he availed himself of his readings for the interest of those whom he will instruct. That is all.

But even the express formulas of scriptural quotation, of these authors, do not give us the certainty that they cite canonical texts. Thus the same Clemens introduces by, *It is written*, phrases which are not contained in the whole Bible, and which may possibly be taken from apocryphal books.† The author of the Epistle, attributed to Barnabas, quotes, as taken from a prophet, the following words: "When will these things be consummated? When the wood will be cast down and raised again, and when blood will drop from it."‡ Elsewhere, according to him, the Scriptures have said: "At the consummation of time, the Lord will give to destruction the sheep of the pasture, their fold and their tower."§ In Ignatius, also,|| there is found a quotation of this kind. According to him, the Holy Ghost said verbatim: "Do nothing without your bishop!" These are evidently non-canonical texts, and these formulas: *It is written*, and other similar ones, in reference to which there is so much noise made in our days, should induce those who attach to them so high an importance, to make reservations. We freely admit that these formulas imply the acknowledgment of a scriptural authority, quite specially inspired and thus raised above every literary and merely human work; it is only the more significant, that they are seldom used in the Greek texts of the apostolical fathers, when they quote words of the

* Ibid., c. 27: Τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσῃ τῷ πρᾶ τει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ; comp. Wisdom 12:12.

† Chap. 90: γέγραπται μνησθήσομαι ἡμεράς ἀγαθῆς καὶ ἀνασῶσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν θηπῶν ὑμῶν; comp. fourth book of Esdras 2:16.— Chap. 23: ἡ γραφή λέγει ταλαιπωροὶ εἰσιν οἱ διψυχοὶ οἱ διστάζοντες τὴν ψυχὴν x. c. λ.

‡ Ep. Barn., c. 12.

§ Ibid., c. 16.

|| Ign. ad Philad. c. 7.

apostles, while they occur quite frequently, connected with quotations of a doubtful origin.

All these facts could yet be sustained by considerations drawn from the nature and tendency of the evangelical instruction, which is contained in the documents in question. It could very easily be shown that the few allusions to phrases of St. Paul, which occur there, do not prove that the authors had the intention to present authentically, to establish, to comment, the instruction of the apostle. We have, elsewhere, stated* the dogmatical substance of the epistles of Barnabas and Clemens, and whoever does not close his eyes to evidence, is obliged to acknowledge that there exists a great difference, in this respect, between them and the epistles of the apostles. It would be easy to point out the same fact in regard to the theology of the epistles of Ignatius. But discussion of this kind may be dispensed with here. These authors are, for us, witnesses who may be consulted on what was said and believed in their time, by themselves and by the churches in the midst of which they lived. In this capacity, they ought to be heard, whatever may be the value of their theology. Now, it is according to their testimony, that we believe ourselves authorized to say that, until about the year 130, the writings of the apostles, although they continued to spread in Christendom, and to be used directly and indirectly, for the instruction of the congregations, do not yet form a special collection, destined to compete with the Old Testament in the periodical and stated readings; that tradition is valued and profited by, with an equal confidence, and that when the question was to invoke spiritual inspired authorities, they are chosen outside of what we now call the New Testament, and without always having a very clear idea of a Canon, without making a very judicious choice of the texts, and without showing a very strict attachment to the letter.

* *Histoire de la theologie apostolique*, V. 2, book VI.

ARTICLE III.

SOBER-MINDEDNESS.*

By H. L. BAUGHER, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

A sober mind, is a sound and healthy mind, not only in its constitution, but also, in its exercises. In its applications and relations to life, the phrase has been used to signify, at one time, to *judge rightly*, at another to be *prudent and cautious*, and to do all that is done *advisedly*, at another, to *think and to resolve modestly concerning oneself*, and finally to be *sober and continent*, to live *temperately, chastely and purely*.

The theme of our discourse, then is Sober-Mindedness, and this is addressed to *young men*. To show the universality of the application to the subject, Titus, who was appointed to deliver the exhortation, was exhorted to afford, in his own character and life, an illustration of the theme, that he might be a pattern of good works unto others.

Sober-mindedness may be regarded by some, as of little value in itself, and of easy acquisition, at any time. They who entertain this opinion, err egregiously, and give evidence of the fact, that they know but little of the subject. For an attainment, such as this, is equivalent to complete self-government, or self-control. The wise man has written most expressively, "He that is slow to anger, is better than the mighty, and he that reukth his spirit, than he that taketh a city," whilst the same oracle of truth declares, "He that hath no rule over his own spirit, is like a city that is broken down, and without walls." Consider, for a moment, the subject, the human soul or spirit, how wonderfully and fearfully constituted! Made originally in the image of God, and holding converse with Him; with powers of perception, so as to become acquainted with the world, and the Maker of it; with powers of memory to retain, and imagination to create, with instinctive impul-

* Baccalaureate Discourse, delivered in connection with the Commencement exercises of Pennsylvania College, August 4th 1867. The Discourse is based upon the words: "Young men, likewise, exhort to be sober-minded."

ses, and appetites and passions; with power to love and to hate, to do good and evil, to bless and to curse, and, then, think of these powers perverted from the object intended by their Creator, subordinated and controlled by a wicked and malicious spirit, the prince of the power of the air, who mars and destroys, to the extent of his ability, all that is holy and good; and, then add to these attributes immortality and indestructibility, and you have a glimpse of the being with whom you have to do, and which each one calls himself. There is a world within us, mightier than that without us, and quite as mysterious; mightier for good or evil to ourselves, than all worlds beside, for every man determines his own character and eternal condition. Then, as to the facility with which this power may be acquired, let those testify who have made the effort. Who has formed good resolutions, and has not broken them? Who has purposed, and has not failed to perform? Let the great Apostle of the Gentiles speak on this subject, for the whole human family: "For that which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

The importance of Sober-mindedness in young men, may be seen from the fact, that it is necessary, in order that they may justify the reasonable expectations of parents and friends. With what fond affection does the young mother caress her darling boy, the pride of her heart. How does her imagination, colored by the various hues of love, carry her forward into the unseen future, and surround her beloved son, as youth and man, with grace of person and beauty of face, with intelligence and moral virtue, with the favor of God and man, with success in his enterprises, and the approving smiles of conscience. She looks forward, also to the time, when, in her old age, she can lean upon her son, and when the fond affection, which she now bestows upon him, will come back to her, in all the joyousness of grateful and tender love. She never dreams that her child will be passionate, selfish, self-willed, disobedient, vain, a spendthrift, licentious, intemperate. The father looks with pride upon his son, as he grows up through boyhood, to youth and manhood, and fancies the honor which he will reflect upon him, and how he can safely entrust to him the interests of the household, with the cares and anxieties, which have

so long rested upon himself. He could not be persuaded to believe, that it is possible for his son to deceive, or purloin, or to be mean and dishonest. Yet, without Sober-mindedness in the son, all these evils, and more, may come upon him. Oh, how the warm, gushing affections of fond parents, cluster around the youthful idol, and the atmosphere in which he moves, even down to old age, is serene and rose-colored, and perfumed with all loveliness, when, too soon, the illusion vanishes, the clouds gather thickness, and burst with fearful violence upon the parental hearts, and the idol is disclosed, in the clear atmosphere of truth, to have become a monster! Could we read and decipher the significancy of the wrinkles, and lines of sorrow and distress, which mark the faces of so many parents, even young in years, it would be found that, for every line of sorrow in the face, there is one on the heart, effacing the bright picture, long ago written there. We would find crushed hopes, bleeding, lacerated hearts, broken and ruined by the beloved son, who was rebellious and self-willed.

The importance of this subject, may be learned from its relationship with the Church. The young are the growing pillars of the Church, and soon it will rest upon them. The aged, who have toiled in her service, and expended their energies in her welfare, will soon pass away, and the young and vigorous must fill up the ranks of the hosts of God's elect, as they are thinned by the great enemy death. Our hopes, then, for the welfare and activity of the Church, lean upon the young men. They will give character to the membership, and to the ministry. They will, by the grace of God, constitute an active, efficient, spiritual, and successful Church, or they will not rise above a cold, formal, lifeless body, which is a dead weight in the world, pressing down the upward tendency of truth in the soul, crushing out holy aspirations, bringing the Church, in its spirit and life, to the level of the world, and making her the refuge of ungodliness. Let us assume that our young men, that occupy the pews and have become professed members of the Church, are Sober-minded. They are judicious and cautious in their estimate of men and things, and in their intercourse with others, are careful how they speak. They set a guard upon their lips, lest they sin with their tongues. Whatever they do, or purpose, it is with advice, so that they bring no dis-

grace upon that blessed name, by which they are called. They are modest and retiring, and are not puffed up with an erroneous and exalted opinion of themselves, as though the wheels of society could not move without them. They are truthful, honest, temperate in all their lawful enjoyments, chaste and pure in thought, and word, and deed. Such young men would be the admiration of their fellows. They would be the joy of the Church. They would secure at once the confidence, not only of the aged in the Church, but of the world also. A congregation of such men would be a power in the community. They would exert an influence for good, which the world could not resist.

With these, contrast a congregation of young men who are thoughtless and careless, self-willed and rash, arrogant and assuming, impure in thought and word, unchaste and indolent, spending their time, if in business, in making it tributary to present pleasures, if out of business, wasting it in worldly and unprofitable amusements. With such a community there would be neither temporal nor spiritual prosperity. The blessing of God could not rest upon them, for they give evidence, that they are not the children of God. These remarks apply, with increased force, to those who are preparing for the gospel ministry. If any where, here we look for Sober-mindedness. Not simply a grave and sober face, a demure demeanor and downcast look, whilst the heart, the soul, is erect and strong to do evil. The student who is looking forward to the ministry, whilst in the preparing school and college, and says to himself, I need not be Sober-minded here, all is gay and lively, I will do as others do, and goes with the multitude to do evil, breaks the laws of College, and is pleased with those who practice mischief, has yet to learn what it is to be a Christian. May the Church and the world be delivered from the curse of such ministers! The young man who takes upon himself the vows of Christ, and in Him enters into covenant with God, has entered into a relationship so solemn, whether viewed in reference to God or to himself, so important in its interests for time and for eternity, as to make him continually Sober-minded. And if, in addition to this, he has consecrated himself to the work of the ministry, and desires to preach Christ to others, he can not begin too soon to preach by precept and example. That is a serious mistake, made by many, to

suppose that their work does not begin until they have been officially and formally ordained. The Christian life begins with regeneration, and with this great change, begin the active duties of the Christian life. These continue with the continuance of life, and there is no time, or condition, or circumstances in which the believer can be placed in which these duties cease to be binding. No change of place, or company, or state, can lift from the shoulders of the believer, the yoke and the burden which Christ has graciously put upon them. From this warfare there is no release, whilst there remains a single enemy in the heart, or in the world, until the great Captain of our salvation exclaim, "It is enough, come up hither."

What is true of the Church and the ministry, is equally true of our country. We may well tremble for our country, when our young men are disobedient to their parents, violators of the laws, rebellious against the government, in business dissatisfied with small but honest gains, reckless speculators, eager to become rich in order to live luxuriously and without care, in pleasures fast young men, or imitators, according to their means, of those who are. In politics, fierce in detraction and vituperation, rash in measures, supplementing the want of sound sense and political knowledge by zeal and fervency. Never more, than now, did our country need Sober-mindedness in her young men. In the hour of her trial and dangerous conflict with injustice and oppression, may she not want men of sound minds and honest hearts, who will have the courage to do right, in the face of danger and detraction, and who will not count their reputations or their lives dear to them, so that they may perpetuate to their countrymen, the blessings of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness!

In fine, we can truly say that, without Sober-mindedness, no young man can attain the end of life. Without this grace or virtue, men will not even consider what is the end of life. In this country, with the increase of population, and the multiplied means of sense, gratification and the increased cost of production, the question how a young man is to make even a living, is becoming a subject of serious inquiry. Life is a serious, thoughtful reality, not as it is too often presented in books of fiction, to the excitable imaginations of the young. To know what life is, we must enter the workshop of the mechanic, the field and barn of the farmer, the hut of the poor la-

borer, the brain of the thinker, whether statesman, minister, merchant, or pleader and, above all, the hospital and the sick room. Here no sophistry of reasoning, or rhetoric can conceal the facts as they are. Hard work of brain and muscle, attention, carefulness, sobriety, honesty, all that is included under the term *Sober-mindedness*, is necessary for the life that now is. He who dwells in the Fairy-land of the future, must expect to live as the Fairies do, but he that realizes that he is endowed with an animal body, and a rational soul, will feel the necessity of labor for both. More than this, he will realize the necessity of self-denial and sacrifice, when he is young and vigorous, so that he may lay by him in store, for the days of sickness, and feebleness of old age, when they shall come. The wise man has written with the pen of inspiration: "If a man live many years and rejoice in them all; yet let him remember the days of darkness; for they shall be many." But when we cast our eyes beyond the confines of this life and its necessities, and contemplate the interests of the immortal soul, how thoughtful and serious life becomes. How these interests swell out and enlarge themselves into infinity, how they lay hold of eternal happiness, and eternal misery, and all that is worth living, or laboring for, clusters around the soul. The soul then, sound in the faith in Christ Jesus, justified by faith in him, and under the influence of the impelling power of his love, laboring, speaking, giving, spending, and being spent for him, that is the great end of life. I leave you then to judge how needful *Sober-mindedness* is, to the attainment of this great end. Methinks, that under the constraining force of such an affection, and with the burden of duties which it imposes, the soul could never trifle, and must always be active. From what has thus far been said, it must be apparent that *Sober-mindedness* is no trifling acquisition. The next question which presents itself is, how may it be secured? We reply: 1. By considering its value, and the difficulty of acquiring it. No man will put forth efforts, to acquire that, of which he knows nothing. The object of this discourse, is to set before you the value of this virtue, that you may dwell upon it, and be induced to make corresponding efforts to secure it. Consider, then, how *Sober-mindedness* will influence your intellectual character, placing you in a condi-

tion of unruffled calmness, and undisturbed equanimity, a condition most favorable to mental development, and mental acquisition, in opposition to the turmoil, the cloud and the darkness of the soul, under the influence of strong animal appetites or desires. When the soul is under the control of passion, her perceptions and conceptions are all colored and distorted. Nothing is seen in its true light or due proportion and connection. Truth is not seen, except in part, and, therefore, cannot be apprehended, nor retained. On the other hand, levity and trifling, foolish talking and jesting, unfit the mind for serious thought or progress in knowledge. The mind, which is ever ready to engage in fun and frolic, is unprepared to grasp great thoughts, and to contemplate those truths in nature, and grace, which exalt, and enlarge and transform the soul. Hence, it is that so many young men, like little children, are unable to stand alone in their studies, and look around for some one, or something to lean upon. Hence, the desire for associated study, and the helps which feeble minds seek to aid them on the royal road to learning. All such helps, however they may relieve a present difficulty, are positively enfeebling and hurtful to the mind. No young man who continues to use them, will ever have the strength of mind, or the courage to lean upon himself. Equally great is the power of Sober-mindedness, upon the moral character. For it chastens and controls the imagination, and the passions, which lead the soul astray from the path of rectitude. The holiest men, and the most heavenly minded, have been the most Sober-minded.

2. By a determined effort of the will to secure this state of mind, and to remove the obstacles in the way of acquiring it. This will necessitate watchfulness. The movements of thought, and the causes of suggestion are so capricious, oftentimes so sudden and unexpected, that the soul must be continually on her guard. There are so many enemies to every form of good both within us, and without us, that we can not be safe without constant watchfulness. We require then, watchfulness to detect the evil, and strength of will to subdue it. Do thoughts of insult, or injury, or the desire of revenge, or sensual pleasure rise in the soul, then must the will be determined and active at once to change the current of thoughts, and subdue the desire. Does indolence, or the love of ease, or the deceitful day-dream, steal over the soul, then

must the will, the governor of the soul, rouse the powers within, to resist the insidious foe. But if there be no watchfulness, and the soul reposes securely in her unconscious strength, or the will be feeble and timid, then will the enemy rush in, like a flood, overpower the will, lead the imagination captive, and open the flood-gates of passion to the indulgence of all evil.

3. With all our personal efforts, we will fail without the help of God. When we have done what we can, let us implore the presence and the blessing of Almighty God. His blessing makes rich, and there is no sorrow connected with it. Every good gift, and every perfect gift comes from Him. We need his aid continually. The powers, which we possess, of whatever kind, are His gift. The proper exercise, and the continuance of them, depend upon Him. The man is a fool, who imagines that he does not need the help of God, and he is profoundly ignorant, who does not know that in Him we live, move and have our being. The young man, who distrusts his own strength and wisdom, and leans upon the strength and wisdom of God every day, can not fail of success in his life-work. He has secured the friendship of the Sovereign of the Universe. With His friendship, he cannot fail to secure that of all others, whom he may need. He is calm and secure under the shadow of the Almighty. All that befalls him, whether joyous or grievous, promotes his highest welfare. He fears no evil, for no evil shall befall him, no plague shall come nigh his dwelling. Thus living and laboring, he accomplishes the end of life. With sound mind, and sound heart, and the help of God, he goes forward in his life-work, a blessing to his friends, to the Church, to his country, and the world, until his work is completed; then he rests from his labors, and his works do follow him. May you, my young friends, leaning upon the all-sufficiency of God, accomplish your life-work, and rest for your salvation, in the righteousness of Jesus Christ!

ARTICLE IV.

COVENANT OF SALT.

This expression occurs, several times, in the Scriptures. In the Second Book of Chronicles (13 : 5) it is written : "Ought ye not to know, that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and to his sons by a *covenant of salt*?" In Numbers (18 : 19) we read : "All the heave offerings of the holy things which the children of Israel offer unto the Lord, have I given thee, and thy sons and thy daughters with thee, by a statute forever : it is a *covenant of salt* forever before the Lord unto thee, and to thy seed with thee." Also in Leviticus (2 : 13) it is said : "And every oblation of thy meat offering shalt thou season with salt ; neither shalt thou suffer *the salt of the covenant* of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering : with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt."

Salt purifies and preserves. It is active in its operation and permanent in its effects. It has always been regarded as an emblem of purity. So, also, it has been considered a symbol of peace and perpetuity, a token of sincere, abiding friendship, a promise of pure, continued fidelity, a pledge of an unbroken, everlasting compact. It means here a firm, incorruptible, lasting covenant, a solemn intention, a distinct understanding and an implicit declaration on the part of those concerned, that they will do nothing to the injury or prejudice of each other's interests, that they will be faithful in the maintenance of their mutual agreement and obligation.

Some think that, as in connection with all sacrifices, salt was used, a covenant of salt implies a compact ratified by solemn sacrifices. Among the ancients, salt was generally offered with all their sacrifices and covenants. There is frequent reference made to the article of salt in their religious ceremonies and rites. At a very early period, the Greeks used cakes, *σάλαι*, baked of coarse barley, or meal mixed with salt. Among the Romans, the knife and the altar were consecrated for the offering by sprinkling them with a mixture of salt and the meal of new

barley, or spelt roasted, *mola salsa*. With the same, the head of the victim was sprinkled, and this is what is properly expressed by the word *immolare*. Homer, in the solemnities connected with religious worship, has given several illustrations of the sacred use of salt. For example in the *Iliad* (Lib. I, 584) he says:

"Then near the altar of the darting king
Disposed in rank, their hecatomb they bring;
With water purify their hands, and take
The offering of the salted cake."

Also, we find in the *Iliad* (Lib. IX., 281):

"Above the coals the smoking fragment burns,
And sprinkles sacred salt from lifted urns."

In the *Amphitruo* (A. 2, S. 2, 119), Plautus says: *Aut mola salsa hodie, aut thure*. Cicero, in his *De Divinatione*, (Lib. II. Cap. 17,) uses the expression: *Simul ac molam et vinum insperseris*. Virgil in the *Æneid* (Lib. II., 133) introduces one of his characters, as saying:

*Mihi sacra parari
Et salsae fruges, et circum tempora vitæ.*

There is also an allusion to the same practice in Virgil's *Bucolica* (VIII., 82): *Sparge molam et fragiles incende bitumine lauros*. Thus, also, in Horace (Lib. III., Car. 23) we read:

*Mollicit aversos Penates
Farre pio saliente mica.*

Martial says: *Consumpsi salsasque molas et turis acervos*. Pliny repeatedly refers to the practice in such expressions as *salsa supplicare* and *salsa litare*, and adds, that no sacrifice was offered to the Gods without the salted cake.

In the services of the Jewish altar, salt was considered an indispensable requisite. Their religious ceremonies were something of a festival, in which those who participated were supposed to be the favored guests of God, as eating and drinking at his table. Thus it was, that almost every bargain or contract was concluded and confirmed, and as salt was considered an invariable or necessary appendage, on such occasions, it came to signify an emblem of permanent friendship, and the phrase "Covenant of Salt," only another name for the most inviolable

and enduring compact. The act of eating another man's salt was a sacred pledge of fidelity, which he feared to violate. To eat salt with an individual, and then to become his enemy, was the most treacherous act that could be committed, and was visited with condign punishment.

In the East, from time immemorial, men have been accustomed to eat salt together, and this, in their judgment, constituted the inviolability of an engagement, the sanctity of the obligation assumed. At the present day, the Arab princes, in making a compact, are in the habit of eating a piece of bread sprinkled with salt, and this league is designated *Barach Milech*. Salt, it is said, is chosen, not only on account of its inherent qualities, the peculiar properties which it possesses, but because it enters so largely into all nutritious preparations. It is practically a representative of the whole act of eating. A man, when he has eaten food of any kind at your table and enjoyed your hospitalities, often says, he has eaten salt with you. Salt, being so prominent an ingredient, is thus regarded by a figure of rhetoric, as a part taken for the whole.

Numerous illustrations are furnished of travellers in the East, who, after being plundered by the wandering tribes of the Desert, have thrown themselves upon the favor of some civilized Arab, and claimed his protection, and he, upon receiving them into his tent, and presenting them with salt has immediately relieved their distress, and never abandoned them, until they were conducted to a place of safety. Other striking instances are mentioned, indicating the sacredness of salt, as a symbol of friendship and fidelity in every agreement. Tamerlane speaking of a traitor who had deserted and gone over to the enemy, and who afterwards became loyal and obedient, remarks: "My salt, which he had eaten, filled him with remorse till, at length, he fled from a new master and threw himself on my mercy." Baron du Tott, referring to an individual who was desirous of cultivating with him friendly relations, tells us on his departure: "He promised, in a short time, to return. I had already attended him half way down the stair-case, when stopping, and turning briskly to one of my domestics, he said, 'Bring me directly some bread and salt.' What he requested was brought; when taking a little salt between his fingers, and putting it with a mysterious air, on a bit of bread, he eat it with a devout gravity, assuring me that I might now rely on him."

During the British War in the East Indies, there was the greatest indignation felt, as well as the most bitter complaints expressed, that those who had eaten English salt, had rebelled against English authority. D'Herbelot gives the following incident, among the other exploits of Jacob ben Laith, who is said to have broken into a palace, and having collected a large amount of booty, which he was on the point of carrying away, his foot came in contact with something which made him stumble. Supposing the article might be of some value, and putting it to his mouth, the better to distinguish it, he soon ascertained that it was a lump of salt. This made such an impression upon his mind, and so deeply touched his heart, that he left his plunder without removing any part of it with him. Great was the surprise in the palace on the next morning, on discovering that Jacob was the guilty man. Confessing the crime, and with so much apparent sincerity did he, on inquiry, give all the circumstances, that he at once won the confidence, and secured the favor of the Prince. He was employed by him in many important enterprises, and attained to the highest position in the Army. On the death of the Sovereign, he became his successor—absolute master of the throne—and extended his conquests far and wide. His reverence for salt, and the principles, which it symbolized, laid the foundation of his character, and prepared him for his subsequent triumphant career.

The Salt of the Covenant is, then, the emblem of the integrity, and incorruptible character of the covenant. God's covenant is one that is to endure, a compact that is never to be broken. It speaks to us of union with the Father, of indissoluble bonds, of an everlasting covenant of love and faithfulness. We consent to be his obedient, loving children; He promises to be our kind, protecting, loving Father.

Communion with God is often represented as a feast, to which we are invited, in which God ratifies or confirms his covenant with us. Whilst the use of salt indicates the perpetuity of the covenant entered into with believers, it, also, represents the influence of divine truth, the grace of the Holy Spirit, by which their services being seasoned are rendered acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, and their usefulness is advanced in counteracting the effects of human depravity, and diffusing a savor of purity, in ex-

erting a conservative influence upon all, with whom they are brought in contact.

It is the privilege, as well as the duty of the Christian, to be united to God, in "a covenant of salt," in an abiding friendship, a perfect union, an everlasting compact, a covenant, ever to be regulated by pure motives and holy principles. Then he becomes his chosen one, truly his child, and an heir of immortal glory. Then shall he "abide under the shadow of the Almighty," and "not be afraid for the terror by night, nor for the arrow that flieth by day." He can say of the Lord, "He is my refuge and my fortress, my God, in him will I trust." "He hath remembered his covenant forever.

ARTICLE V.

CONVERSION. TRANSLATED FROM THE LOCI THEOLOGICI OF DR. MARTIN CHEMNITZ.*

By Rev. HENRY E. JACOBS, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

In Conversion, is the Will merely Passive?

From what has been previously said, this question can be decided without any difficulty: but on account of the two extremes, Pelagianism and Fanaticism, there is often a digression from the path which lies between them. For here it happens, just as *Basil*, in his Forty-first epistle, says concerning nurserymen, when they desire to correct the crookedness of a tender tree, they err by drawing it too much to the other side. *Erasmus* (2. *Hyperasp.*) collects certain contradictions from the writings of Luther, by means of which, he wishes to show that Luther, in his discussion concerning the freedom of the will, is not consistent with himself. "Because," says he, "he sometimes affirms, that man can neither think, nor do, either good or evil, but that all things happen by an absolute necessity; at other times, he declares that the free will can act wickedly; and at still other times, that by the assistance of

* *Locus, De Viribus Humanis, Cap. 7.*

grace, it can do all things." But in the same manner, Paul, also, may be said to contradict himself. "The Gentiles do by nature, the things contained in the law," Rom. 2 : 14; and, "We are not sufficient of ourselves to think anything," 2 Cor. 3 : 5; and, "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me," Phil. 4 : 13.

Our theologians, also, although they agree, frequently seem to speak differently, when one opposes Pelagianism and another Fanaticism : and, therefore, contradictions are imagined, and unnecessary controversies excited. Nevertheless, we must proceed very cautiously and unwaveringly between the Pelagians and the Fanatics, lest while we wish to avoid Scylla, we fall into Charybdis. I will therefore, submit three observations, but a little attention to which, will show the true foundation, and shed light upon many things which seem hard to be understood.

Observation first. The division, which assigns to the free will four states, is well known, and commonly adopted. The *first* state was in natural innocency before the Fall. The *second* is in corrupt nature, since the Fall. The *third* is after the recovery of the fallen nature, by the Son of God, and its renovation by the Holy Spirit. We have said before, that this is called the liberty of grace, where strength is made perfect in weakness, 2 Cor. 12 : 9. The *fourth* state is after glorification, when there will be no infirmity, no flesh to strive against the Spirit, but we will be equal to the angels, Math. 12 : 3; yea, God will be all in all, 1 Cor. 15 : 28. This is the glorious liberty of the children of God, Rom. 8 : 2.

Hence, we derive a plain and easy reply. Concerning the first and fourth states, there is no contention. But if concerning the second state, the question be asked, In spiritual actions, what can the free will do, in itself, in its own nature, through its own powers, without the grace of renovation; the correct reply would be, that it cannot effect anything. For a dead nature does nothing. If, likewise, concerning the second state, the question be asked, Whether from its own natural powers, either as a partial cause, or by whatever other name it may be called, it contributes toward conversion any faculty or action; the true reply would be, that it is merely passive. And, therefore, in accordance with what has been said, *Augustine* was unwilling to call the first motion of conversion, co-operating

grace, but merely operating (*gratia operans*). But when it is asked concerning the third state, Whether there be any freedom of the will; in this state as it has been already liberated, Scripture expressly replies, 2 Cor. 3 : 17, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." John 8 : 36, "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." Rom. 6 : 18, "Being made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Therefore, it is evident, that in this state, the will is not inactive. "For the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil," 1 John 3 : 8; that he might free from sin, Rom. 6 : 18; that he might quicken the dead, Eph. 2 : 5.

Augustine also used this distinction in replying to 2 Tim. 2 : 21, "If a man, therefore, purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified and meet for the master's use," saying, The condition of man not as yet believing, is one thing : but that of man illuminated and restored by grace, is another. Notice must also be taken of the fact, that in the time of Augustine, there were some who accepted those things concerning the captivity and servitude of the will, which were maintained, against the Pelagians, in such a sense, as if, even after renovation, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, there was neither liberty, nor action of the liberated will; but that it received renovation, just as a stone, or wax receives an impression.

On account of the disputations of these Enthusiasts, Augustine wrote his book, *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, just as previously, he had written against the Pelagians, *De Natura et Gratia*. He says, Cap. 2, *De Libero Arbitrio*, "When anything is wrought according to God, this does not detract from man's own will." Cap. 16, "It is certain that we will, when we will : but he who works in us, causes us to will. It is also certain, that we act, when we act : but he causes us to act, by granting to the will most efficacious power, as he says in Ezekiel 36 : 27, "I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." *Hypognasticon* 3, "Let no one so trust concerning grace, as though God, who has provided the death of his Son, does not require works of the free will. Yea, let it depart from evil and do good, let it watch, ask, seek, knock."

This doctrine, concerning the liberty of the new creature, should be diligently taught: 1. That we may learn to recognize the nature and the greatness of the favor of renovation. 2. Lest any fail of the grace of God, Heb. 12 : 15. 3. Lest we grieve the Holy Spirit, who wishes to assist us. For Paul thus exhorts the Corinthians, "That ye receive not the grace of God in vain." But it should always be added, that this grace is not complete; and that strength is made perfect in weakness.

Moreover, if any one should ask, whether in this state, the will is purely passive or active, *Augustine* elegantly replies, *De Correptione et Gratia*, Cap 2: "Let them understand, that if they are the sons of God, they are impelled by the Spirit of God; that, that which is performed, they perform; and when they act, they should give thanks to Him, by whom they are impelled. For they are impelled that they may act, not that they may be destitute of action." So also Paul declares, 2 Cor. 13 : 3, "Christ speaking in me."

Observation second. Conversion or renovation is not such a change as is immediately, in one moment, accomplished and perfected in all its parts: but it has its beginnings and progress, by which in great weakness it is made perfect. We should not, therefore, think, "I will wait with a secure and inactive will, until conversion or renovation, without any absolute motion of mine, takes place by the working of the Holy Spirit." For no one can show the mathematical point, in which the freed will begins to act. But when preceding grace (*gratia praeveniens*), i. e., the first beginning of faith and conversion, is given to man, the strife of the flesh and Spirit immediately begins; and it is manifest that this strife cannot occur without a motion of our will. For while Moses was alive, the Holy Spirit contended in him, against his flesh, in a different manner from that, in which Michael contended with the Devil concerning his dead body, Jude 9. In the beginning, likewise, the desire is more undefined, the assent weaker, the obedience feebler: and these gifts ought to grow. But they grow in us, not as a block is drawn by violent impulse, or as lillies grow without labor and care, but by endeavoring, striving, asking, seeking, knocking; and this not of ourselves, it is the gift of God. He who gives talents to his servants says: Occupy till I come, Luke 19 : 13. He does not say, Hide them in the earth.

Paul, also, uses a very plain word, 2 Tim. 1:6, "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up (*αναζωοποιῶ*) the gift of God which is in thee."

What, therefore, is taught concerning preceding, preparing and working grace, has this sense: That in conversion, our part is not first, but that God through the Word and divine inspiration, goes before us, moving and impelling the will. But after this motion of the will, divinely made, the human will is not purely passive; on the contrary, moved and aided by the Holy Spirit, it does not resist, but yields and becomes a co-worker with God. There is a similar sentiment in *De Dogmatibus Ecclesiæ*: God works in us, so that we will and do what he wishes; nor does he permit that to be inactive in us, which he has given us to use, and not to neglect: so, therefore, we are co-workers of the grace of God, and if we should see that anything in us becomes feeble on account of our remissness, we should earnestly go again to him, who heals all our shortcomings, and who has commanded us to pray, Lead us not into temptation.

But *Augustine* has brought forward an excellent example in his own conversion, in which we see a living answer to this question, how amidst the hidden sparks, and feeble beginnings of preceding grace, the will is not inactive, but the strife between the flesh and the Spirit begins. For questions of this character should be decided from individual cases; they are best known, not from idle disputations, nor from the examples of others, but from personal experience, as perceived in the serious exercises of our own repentance. But as many live without any exercise of faith or prayer, they collect many inexplicable things, concerning matters, of which they have no knowledge. On this account, the consideration of the example furnished by the conversion of *Augustine*, will be useful.

We have said at another time, that whilst reading the *Hortensius* of *Cicero*, he had from the strength of his own free will, conceived a desire for truth; that he began to have a distaste for the Scriptures, and embraced the heresy of the Manicheans. But the beginning of his saving conversion, because he was preceded by the divine grace, he thus describes, *Confessiones, Liber 5: Cap. 13-14*:* "I listened attentively to

*The citations from *Augustine's Confessions*, may be found in the American translation, edited by W. G. T. Shedd, D. D., Andover, 1865, on pages, 111, 173, 178, 181, 186, 200.

Ambrose preaching to the people, not with the motive, with which I should have listened, but as it were, for the purpose of closely studying his eloquence; of the matter, concerning which he discoursed, I was a careless and scornful looker on. Yet, together with the words which I loved, there came also into my soul, although gradually, the things which I had neglected. For, first, it began to appear to me, that the Catholic doctrine could be defended: but it did not as yet seem victorious. But then I earnestly bent my mind, to see if in any way, I could, by any certain proof, convict the Manicheans of falsehood; therefore, wavering, I determined to abandon the Manicheans, and resolved to become a Catechumen in the Catholic Church, until something certain would manifest itself." *Lib. 7: Cap. 21.* "Most eagerly, therefore, did I seize the venerable writings of the Spirit of God, and chiefly those of the Apostle Paul. Whereupon, those difficulties vanished, wherein he once seemed to me, to contradict himself, and not to agree with the testimony of the law. And I began, and found that whatever truth I read there, I learned with the praise of grace: that whoso sees may not so glory as if he had not received, not only what he sees, but also that he sees." *Lib. 8: 20,* "I went to Simplicianus, and explained to him the circuits of my wandering. He narrated to me how Victorinus a celebrated Professor of Rhetoric, began to read Scripture, and said to Simplicianus secretly, You may know that I am already a Christian. He replied, I will not believe it, until I see you within the Church of Christ. Victorinus jestingly said, Do walls therefore, make Christians? (for he was afraid to offend his friends). But afterwards when by reading and earnest meditation, he increased in firmness, he suddenly and unexpectedly said to Simplicianus. Let us go into the Church; I wish to become a Christian. Finally, when the hour for professing his faith had arrived (which profession is generally made at Rome, by those who are to be baptized, from an elevated position, in sight of the believers), the presbyters offered Victorinus the privilege of making his profession more privately (inasmuch, as it was customary to make this offer to some, who on account of bashfulness were likely to be disconcerted); but that he preferred to make his profession openly." *Cap. 5,* "When he related this concerning Victorinus, I was on fire to imitate him; but the enemy held my will, and

thence had made a chain for me, and bound me. But that new will partially wounded which had begun to be in me, was not as yet able to overcome the former strengthened by age. Thus, by my own experience, I understood how the flesh lusts against the Spirit. Thus, the thoughts, with which I meditated upon thee, were like the efforts of those wishing to awake, who, nevertheless, are overcome, and overwhelmed by the depth of sleep. There was nothing which I could reply to thee, calling to me, Arise, Eph. 4, except those dull and drowsy words, Presently—yes, presently—Leave me yet a little while. But my “presently” had no limit; and “Leave me for a little while,” went on for a long while. *Cap. 2.* “Thus I grew sick and was tormented, I groaned, I fretted: and thou, O Lord, didst press upon me inwardly, lest I should again give over. I said to myself, Let it be done now, now be it done: and with the word I went into peace. I stood hard by, and breathed, because a great storm of tears had arisen. How long, O Lord, how long? To-morrow and to-morrow? Why not now, why not this hour? Lo, I hear a voice, Take up, and read.”

I desired to quote these words of Augustine, because from this example, the matter can be better understood, than from many arguments.

Observation Third. In conversion, the Spirit precedes, moves and impels the will, not as in his general action, in which he changes and overturns the designs of the wicked, not thinking of any such thing (as has been shown in a preceding place); but through the word of the gospel. Moreover this is not in the same manner, as the Lord slays the wicked with the spirit of his mouth, 2 Thess. 2 : 8 ; 11 : 4, though he may neither hear, nor read, nor meditate upon the word, yea he may even distort and persecute it. But since faith is by hearing, Rom. 10 : 17, the Holy Spirit works through the word of the gospel, heard or meditated upon, and from it preceding grace begins.

If the expression be understood aright, it is correctly said that there are three causes of good actions: 1. The Word of God; 2. The Holy Spirit; and 3. The Human Will. For the human will does not concur, so as from its own powers to assist spiritual actions, just as in an excellent manner, the three causes, Natural Desire, Learning and Practice, concur. For this was the opinion of Pelagius. But the human will is enumerated among the

causes of good actions: 1. Because it can resist the Holy Spirit, Acts 7:51, and destroy the work of God, Rom. 14:20. For Saul had the Word of God, and the good Spirit of God moved him, *i. e.*, two causes were present. But as Saul opposed Him, by a contrary act of the will, the Holy Spirit departed from him, 1 Sam. 16:14. So, also, Matt 23:37: "How often would I have gathered your children, and ye would not." 2. The human will is enumerated, because the children of God are led by the Holy Spirit, not that being ignorant and unwilling, they should believe, or do that which is right, in the same manner as Balaam blessed, and his ass spoke, Num. 22:28, and Caiphas prophesied, John 11:51. But grace makes those willing, who are unwilling, because it works to will. "I delight in the law of the Lord," Rom. 7:22; to *will* is present with me," v. 18; "I *would* do good," v. 21. If I do this *willingly*, I have a reward," 1 Cor. 9:17. "There was a readiness to *will*," 2 Cor. 8:11. "Feed the flock of God, not by constraint, but *willingly*," 1 Peter 5:12. "Ye have obeyed from the heart," Rom. 6:17. "That thy benefit should not be, as it were, of necessity, but *willingly*," Philemon 14. "His delight is in the law of the Lord," Ps. 1:1. "I will *voluntarily* sacrifice unto thee," Ps 54:6.

In a good deed, therefore, there is also a concurrence of the human will: not, indeed, a captive and dead will, as it is in itself and by nature, as described in Eph. 2:1 but liberated and quickened by the Holy Spirit. Augustine, therefore, says correctly, *De gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, Cap. 2: "It is certain that our will is required to do that which is right, but we have not this ability from our own strength," but God works in us to will." *De Correptione et Gratia*, Cap. 12. "It is only because the will of the regenerate is enkindled by the Holy Spirit, that they are, therefore, able thus to will; therefore, they will, in this manner, because God works in them to will."

Finally, let notice also be taken of this. Feeling and experience do not come before faith: the work must be begun by the word. Therefore, we should not frame an argument from experience, in this manner: "I do not feel that motion and impulse of will, by which it is necessary that the Holy Spirit should precede us. Therefore I will not hear, I will not meditate, I will not seek, knock, strive, endeavor. But when the mind hearing or meditating,

sustains itself, and does not resist; yea, when it seriously strives, as we have seen in the case of Augustine, it is certain that the Holy Spirit is then at work, moving, impelling, and assisting the will. Therefore, you should seek, you should ask, you should knock. Sometimes, indeed, the heart also feels that which it apprehends in the promise; but frequently, and rather more frequently, it experiences the truth that the Holy Spirit hides his aid in groanings that cannot be uttered, Rom. 8 : 26. Therefore, you should not seek whether you feel, because strength is made perfect in weakness: but in faith, you should trust in God, according to the promise, though you feel nothing, yea, even though you feel the contrary. In accordance with this sentiment, Augustine says, in his treatise on John: "If you are not drawn, pray that you may be drawn."

Notice should also be taken of the fact, that in the time of Augustine, there were some who thought that those who had not felt divinely-inspired motions, should not be reproved; but should only be prayed for. This Augustine refutes in his treatise, *De Correptione et Gratia*. For teaching the word, exhorting and reproving, are the means through which the Holy Spirit goes before the will.

These observations give us much warning, by showing how, from a misunderstanding of Augustine's reply to Pelagius, other errors arose, which he was compelled to refute, and on account of which he had to explain his opinion more clearly. From these remarks, also, there can be drawn a solution of the question concerning the activity of the will, whether, in conversion, it is entirely passive, and whether it is operative in spiritual actions.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DELIVERY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

By Rev. REUBEN WEISER, Manchester, Md.

We here propose to give the circumstances connected with the delivery of this immortal document, in the words

of those who were present on that memorable occasion. In the ninth volume of Luther's works, published at Wittenberg, in 1557, there is an interesting account of the delivery of the Augsburg Confession, in 1530, so full and so minute, that one can, as it were, go back to 1530, and place himself in the very midst of those thrilling scenes. Here we can hear the different persons, who figured so conspicuously on that occasion, speaking in Latin, Spanish, French and Italian, and some of them in very bad German. Everything was done with a solemnity and deliberation becoming the important work. This, to every theologian, but more especially to every Lutheran theologian, is a very interesting subject. As this edition of Luther's works is rare in this country, we propose to translate the narrative for the pages of the *Review*. It is found in Luther's works page 370, *et sqq.*, Vol. IX. Wittenberg.

We shall not give an account of the incipient steps that were taken to make the great Confession, nor shall we, at this time, concern ourselves in reference to its authorship. Melancthon and the other Lutheran theologians understood Luther's views and feelings perfectly well, and they would not have put one sentiment into that document, that he could not approve. That he did not see the identical copy that was read before the Diet, is evident, from the fact that there was no time for it, between its completion and delivery. The Diet of Augsburg was called for the express purpose of adjusting the religious difficulties that had grown out of the labors of Luther. These labors had commenced in 1517, the 31st of October, which is still observed as the anniversary of the Reformation. In 1521 a Diet had been held at Worms, where Luther had been placed under the ban of the Empire. He was bound over "to keep the peace," but he did not keep it. He preached, and prayed and wrote, after his escape from his Wartburg prison, as though no restraints had ever been imposed upon him. During those nine years marvellous changes had taken place in Germany; the reformation had made rapid progress, the preaching and printing of the truth had awakened the public mind, and revolutionized the whole church. The Pope, and his cardinals and bishops were alarmed, and saw that something must be done to check the onward march of the reformation.

Charles V. had just been elected Emperor of the Roman empire, and this was the first Diet he had ever held in Germany. He was a Spaniard by birth and education, he was a bigoted Roman Catholic, and seems to have been exceedingly anxious to save the Roman Catholic Church from distraction. Many false representations concerning the Lutherans, had been made to the young and credulous Emperor. The Lutherans were presented to him as monsters of iniquity, as infidels, and even atheists. He was, for this reason, anxious to ascertain what were the sentiments of these "filthy heretics," as they were called by one of the cardinals. He, therefore, issued his mandate for a Diet, to be held in the imperial city of Augsburg, on the 12th of April, 1530. This mandate was issued on the 21st of January, 1530, from Bologna. The Elector of Saxony was requested to have a declaration of the faith and practices of the Protestants ready. On the 14th of March, the Elector appointed Luther, Melancthon, Justus Jonas and Dr. Bugenhagen to prepare such a document. The first draft of this Confession was presented to the Elector, at Easter, in the city of Torgau. The Schwabach Articles were the ground-work of these Torgau Articles, as those of Torgau were the basis of the Confession. The Elector was much pleased with these Articles; he, therefore, gave his consent to their spirit and import, and requested Melancthon to prepare the Articles to be presented to the Diet. He did this, not, as has been said by some, to exclude Luther from any participation in this great work, but merely because from the mild and gentle Melancthon he expected something more attractive and less repulsive. He wanted to give as little offence as possible, to the Emperor and the Diet.

On the 3rd of April, the Elector of Saxony left for Augsburg. The party consisted of the Elector, his son, John Frederick, his Chancellor Pontanus, or Bruck, the Vice-Chancellor Bayer, Luther, Melancthon, Justus Jonas, and some ten or twelve other Lutheran theologians, one hundred and sixty horsemen, all clad in rich scarlet cloaks, embroidered with gold lace, and a number of other persons, perhaps three hundred in all. This was a grand and imposing cavalcade. When they were about to start from Coburg, the Elector gave peremptory orders, that Luther should remain at Coburg. This was, no doubt, a sad disappointment to the Great Reformer, but as the

Elector assured him that nothing should be done without his consent and advice, he was satisfied. There were three reasons why Luther should not go to Augsburg: 1. He was not summoned to appear there, as he had been to attend the Diet of Worms; the controversy had become a state affair, and was no longer an individual matter. 2. As Luther had been put under the ban of the Empire, at Worms, and that edict had never been revoked, his presence at Augsburg might have been offensive to the Emperor, and the wise and prudent Elector did not wish to give unnecessary umbrage to the Diet. 3. The citizens of Augsburg had written to the Elector, and requested that Luther should not be brought to the Diet, for fear of a riot. These were all satisfactory reasons why Luther should remain at Coburg. There is no evidence that the Elector, or any other person, wished to exclude Luther from participating in the getting up of the Confession. On the 2nd of May, the Elector, with his large retinue, reached Augsburg, and was, to the astonishment of all, the first Prince that arrived, for it had been reported that he would not dare to appear at the Diet. Presently one cavalcade after another came pouring into the city, until it was filled to its utmost capacity. The chivalry of all Germany was there; it was a brilliant assembly, such as Germany had, perhaps, never witnessed. Rev. George Spalatin, the Elector's chaplain, who attended all the meetings of the Diet, kept a private journal of what he saw and heard, and this journal was considered of so much importance, that the editors of Luther's works have incorporated it in his works. In this journal there is much of the gossip of the town, but it seems necessary to make out the picture. Among those Spanish and Italian noblemen, there were often revelings, drunken frolics, and brawls, and even murders were not uncommon. No wonder, for during nearly three months, there were upwards of ten thousand strangers in the little city of Augsburg.

The first contest at Augsburg, between the opposite parties.

The Elector of Saxony, and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, immediately ordered their chaplains to preach the gospel, which they did with great earnestness, to large and attentive congregation. Justus Jonas, Brenz, Sneppf, and other distinguished pastors, preached in the churches of St. Ulric and St. Catherine, with great boldness and

power. The Bishop of Augsburg, also, ordered his priest to preach, but alas! they could say mass better than preach the gospel. The people laughed at their puerile attempts. Before the close of the Diet, more than half the citizens of Augsburg were Protestant in their views. The Emperor was still at Inspruck, and was offended at the preaching of the gospel. He sent a message to the Elector, commanding him at once to suppress it. The Elector consulted his friends on the subject; they were all willing to yield the point, except Pontanus, who said: "If we yield this first point, they will soon crush us." The Emperor was still at Inspruck, where his Chaplain, Gattarina, lay very sick; this good man, of whom the Lutherans had expected much, died on the 8th of June. The Emperor, with his magnificent cavalcade, reached Augsburg on the 15th of June. In the meantime, Melancthon and Pontanus, and all the Protestants, had frequent interviews with the leading men of the Papal party. Melancthon, especially, tried to learn what the Papal party wanted, and shaped his thoughts and words in the Confession to their views, as well as he could, without violating his conscience, or sacrificing the truth. The object of the Confession seems to have been to show the Emperor, who was ignorant on the subject, how little the Lutherans differed from the Church of Rome. This Confession, which was originally called Apology, was written in Latin and German, and it was all written by Melancthon. It was finished—the plan and outlines—Spalatin says, on the 11th of May, four days before the Emperor arrived at Augsburg. As soon as the Emperor arrived, he was informed that the Lutherans still preached in the churches of Augsburg. Here arose another contest. The Emperor insisted upon a suspension of preaching, the Protestants contended for the rights of conscience. At last a compromise was agreed upon; none were to preach, but those appointed by the Emperor. There was great delay about the reading of the Confession. We thought, at one time, it would not be read at all. The Pope's Legate, Cardinal Campeggio, was opposed to it, and when it was read, he was not present. On the 22nd of June, the Emperor informed the Protestant Princes, that he would receive their Confession on the 24th. But when the 24th came, he wished it handed to the Diet without being publicly read, but the Protestants insisted upon its being read. Finally, on the

25th of June, 1530, a day ever memorable in the annals of the Church, at three o'clock in the afternoon, this great Confession was read. The Diet met in a small private chapel. When all was ready, Chancellor Pontanus, and Vice-Chancellor Bayer, appeared before the Emperor, the former with a Latin, the latter with a German, copy. The Emperor wished the Latin copy read, but the Elector of Saxony said: "We are now on German ground, and here German language ought to be used." The Emperor yielded the point. Vice-Chancellor Bayer then read the German copy, in a loud and distinct manner, so that it was heard, not only by those in the chapel (about three hundred,) but by several thousands who had gathered around it. Thus the Protestants had an opportunity to give an account of their faith. In this illustrious document the Church of Christ had boldly spoken. This Confession may be regarded as the united product of the Lutheran Church, although Melancthon himself wrote it, yet he had the assistance of Luther, and Pontanus, and, at least, twenty other distinguished Lutheran theologians, who were at Augsburg during the meeting of the Diet. This was, perhaps, the most stupendous product of the human mind. No such a document had ever been prepared in the whole history of the Church. It is so clear, so rich in thought, so biblical, so reasonable, so impregnable in its positions, and yet so simple and unpretending that it cannot but elicit the admiration of all intelligent men. No wonder some of our fathers considered those who composed it as under the influence of partial inspiration. It was translated into all the languages of Europe, and sent forth in all directions; everywhere it was received with profound respect. It was like the re-publication of a new gospel from heaven. Even the Papal sophists were confounded and disarmed. There was nothing in the Confession that was not true, and they felt it. The Elector of Saxony was so elated, that he wrote an affectionate letter to Luther, that same evening, and congratulated him on what had been accomplished.*

George Spalatín's Account of what Transpired after the Reading of the Confession.

The Duke of Bavaria, a rigid Romanist, said to the

*Vide this interesting letter in Luther's works: Wittenberg, 1552, Edition, page 412.

Elector of Saxony, after the Confession was read, I have never understood your doctrines in that light before. On Sunday the Bishops and Princes of the Papal party, held a meeting, the object of which was to make arrangements for attacking our Confession. In the afternoon, the Emperor rode to the residence of the Bishop of Saltzburg. On Monday the citizens swore allegiance to the Emperor; this was done by raising their hands. Thirty-five years before the citizens of Augsburg had sworn allegiance to the Emperor Maximilian in the same way. It is reported that Erasmus of Rotterdam, was expected, but he is now said to be sick, and cannot, nor will not come. The Queen of Hungary, the Emperor's sister, who arrived to-day, refused to silence her chaplain, Dr. Faber, as the Emperor had requested; she told the Emperor, to his face, that she did not, like her husband and her brother Ferdinand, intend to be hoodwinked by the Romish priests. Our Confession was translated into French by Alexander Schweise, and by order of the Pope's Legate, into Welsh (*i. e.*, Italian), and sent to Rome. Everybody is anxious to get our Confession. It is reported that the Archbishop of Saltzburg said: The Lutherans have written a Confession on white paper, with black ink; if I were the Emperor, I would give them an answer, written with red ink. He received from a Lutheran, a reply, "Let the Emperor take care if he writes with red ink, that it does not spirt in his own face." Duke George seems to be very friendly towards the Elector, but in religious matters, thoughtless and obdurate. There seems to be a scarcity of learned men, in the Emperor's Court. Although there are many monks and priests, yet there are none who seem to understand the matter in hand. The Lutheran pastors are more learned and penetrating. Let us ask God to frustrate the works of the Devil. It is reported that the Pope has agreed that some abuses should be corrected in the Church. The people in the city of Augsburg are much divided, the majority are Zwinglians and Papists, but there are a few Lutherans here. On Tuesday, the Elector of Saxony and George of Brandenburg, paid a visit to the Queen of Hungary, and were very graciously received. On the same day, the Emperor invited the Elector of Saxony to pay him a visit. On Wednesday, things were quiet. Dr. Faber, chaplain to the Queen of Hungary, and an excellent man, furnished us with the

names of the twenty Papal Doctors, who are to refute our Confession, among them we find Dr. John Eck, Cochläus and Dr. Wimpina. We shall see what they will make of it. Since the reading of our Confession, our enemies have become more quiet in regard to our doctrines. Some of the dignitaries of the Romish Church, seem to approve of our position. They wish to do no wrong. On Saturday the Emperor had a long interview with Philip Landgrave of Hesse, in reference to the affairs of the Church. The Strasburg delegates have been trying to treat with a number of free cities, but neither Constance, Ulm, Memmingen, nor Frankfort would accept of their Confession. Strasburg stands alone in her Confession. The Emperor's Confessor said, one day, to Melancthon, I was astonished to find that some of our learned German theologians should object to your doctrine of Justification by Faith, for I have long held that view, and have often so expressed myself in the presence of learned men. The city of Frankfort has signified its intention to stand by the Elector of Saxony and his Confession. We have been requested to furnish our Confession for the kings of England and Portugal, and other Potentates. On Sunday we had a terrible hail storm here; it thundered and lightened most fearfully, and the rain and hail fell in torrents. The people had to wade knee deep in the water in the streets. Such storms are common here, they sometimes last three days. The Emperor's Confessor has to Dr. Wimpina and others openly explained himself so favorably to our cause, that the Papal party refuse to have him in their councils. William, Duke of Bavaria, is reported to have said to Eck: You gave me quite a different account of Luther's doctrine, from that which I learned from the Confession. I was also much disappointed that you could not refute the Lutheran doctrine. Dr. Eck replied: I cannot refute the Lutheran Confession from the Bible, but from the councils and Fathers I can. Then, replied the Duke: I understand you acknowledge that the Lutherans are in the Bible, and you are outside of it. A Spanish nobleman said one day, to Melancthon: Was not Luther a monk, and did he not marry a nun; will they not be the parents of anti-Christ? We hear daily of the progress the Gospel is making all over the world. On Tuesday, after the annunciation of the blessed virgin, the Emperor and our enemies held another meeting. At this meet-

ing, the Estates handed in a paper to the Emperor, setting forth the reasons why they did not concur in, and enforce, the edict of Spire, against the Lutherans. But the Romish Princes and priests made such unbecoming propositions concerning the Gospel, that the Bishops of Augsburg and Mentz were disgusted, and declared, that if they did not act in a more becoming manner, they would have nothing more to do with the matter. Danticus, Bishop of Culen, the king of Poland's delegate, is very favorable to our cause, and freely associates with us. When the Romish Bishops and Princes find out that one of their party is in our favor, they do not invite him to their meetings. They have, on several occasions, excluded Duke Henry of Mecklenburg. The world is blind, stupid and foolish. On Wednesday, our opponents laid before the Emperor, the following books and pamphlets: *Antilogiarum, hoc est, contradictionum M. Lutheri Babylonica ex ejusdem Apostatæ libris per Dr. Johannem Fabii excerpta. Hæreses et errores ex diversis M. Lutheri libris in unum collecti. Hæreses in Sacris Conciliis antea damnatæ per Lutheros iterum ab infervis reductæ. Hæreses et errores Martini Lutheri per Leonem Pontificem ante decennium damnati. Hæreses et errores M. Lutheri ante septennium per Universitatem Parisiensem condemnati. Condemnatio facultatis Theologicæ Lovaniensis Epitome aliquot hæresium et errorum M. Lutheri. Monstra sectarum, ex Luthero et Lutheranis enata. Lutherani Evangelii abominabiles et perniciosi et damnatissimi fructus.*

The Papal party has become very much divided, since the Diet commenced. Some are for peace, others for war. But the above formidable array of heresies made no impression on the Diet; the reading of the Confession had clearly demonstrated, that the Lutherans were no heretics. On Saturday our opponents brought in their refutation of our Confession. Two days after a Spaniard was beheaded in Augsburg, for having stabbed one of his countrymen. When he was on his knees, he requested some one to offer up a Pater Noster; many were willing to do this, and to pray for the poor fellow, but when he requested that masses should be said for his soul, there was none willing to promise this. Many cried out, masses are of no use, and do no good, This may serve to show what progress Luther's teaching had already made in Germany. Our opponents undertook to exclude the delegate of Duke

Gülich from their councils, but he would not yield. The Archbishop of Mentz absented himself on several occasions, from the councils of the Romanists, so they had the dealing of the cards all to themselves. It is reported, that the Emperor has also cited the Swiss Reformers to appear at Augsburg, and that Zwingle, Eccolampadius, Capito, Hedio and Bucer are now here.

Some of these men were there, but as the Lutherans, not even the amiable Melancthon would associate with them, it is not very likely that George Spalatin would go to much trouble to find out whether these distinguished and pious men were there or not. The conduct of the Lutherans towards those pious and learned German Reformers is reprehensible; it is a stain upon their Christian character. "I cannot," says Spalatin, "write how stupid, stubborn and foolish, the sacramentarian fanatics are; all of them, both men, women and children, rich and poor, seem to be infected with this poison. Yesterday I was informed by a citizen of Augsburg, that more than one half of all the people here, are followers of Master Michael, the Zwinglian preacher." It is reported that Cardinal Campeggio, the Pope's Legate, was asked to interfere in this controversy, and assist in adjusting it, but he replied: That inasmuch as the Lutherans had rejected the authority of the Pope, the affair must be settled by the Emperor and the German Princes. On Saturday morning, July 9th, in the Council Chamber, at the instigation of the Emperor, Duke Frederick of Bavaria, and Count Hugo of Mansfield, and the Count von Helfenstein, asked the Elector of Saxony, and those who agreed with him, "Whether the Lutherans were willing to let their defence rest with the Confession, or whether they had anything else to present?" "This," Dr. D'Aubigne says, "was a trap set for the purpose of catching the Protestants, but they were foiled in this, as well as in all other tricks to which they resorted." The Lutherans were too wide awake to be thus easily caught.

The Emperor took counsel of his Spanish Lords, how he was to deal with the Lutherans. They replied in French, That if he found any articles contrary to the faith of the Church, he should use all his power to eradicate them, but if he should find a difference only in things belonging to ceremonies, or abuses, he should not be so rig-

orous. But to get at the true state of the case, they would advise, that the whole matter be referred to a number of learned and pious divines who had taken no part in this controversy. This was sensible, but where were such men to be found? Rome had done her best in this respect. It is reported to-day, that Cardinal Campeggio said to some one: "I have often thought that the great number of monks in the Church would, some time or other, cause us great trouble." Paul Recener, Physician to king Ferdinand, speaks very favorably of our cause.

Count Felix von Werdenberg, one of our most bitter enemies, said the other day: "If there should be war with the Lutherans, I am in for it with all my might." This man engaged in a duel with the Abbot of Weingarten, and soon after died in a fit of debauchery. God have mercy on his soul! When Count Felix was buried, one of the citizens inquired who was dead; having been informed, that it was Count Felix, he exclaimed, Truly God is a just Judge, for no later than yesterday, I heard him say, that he would devote all he had, and even his life to the rooting up of the Lutheran doctrine. But now he has been called to his account. On the 12th of July, says Spalatin, our opponents handed their refutation of our Confession to the Emperor. This refutation contained two hundred and eighty pages of abusive language, undignified, and altogether unfit to be placed beside the Confession. The Emperor was much displeased with its tone and spirit. It is said that he tore out all the leaves but twelve, and ordered the Romish Doctors to do their work over, and to present something milder, and more like the Confession, and not to appear before him with such trash again.

What the contents of the first Refutation was, we do not know. We infer from Spalatin, Melanchthon and Brenz, that it was coarse and violent. It has never been published. The few notes that were taken down by the Lutherans, at the time it was read before the Diet, are not recorded by Spalatin. But on the 3d day of August, the committee on the Refutation, produced another, which is given by Spalatin. As this is an important theological document we furnish it here. It is an additional evidence of what we have already stated, that one great object of Melanchthon in preparing the Confession, was to show

the Roman Catholics how little the Lutherans differed from them.

Extracts of the Principal Points of our Confession Refuted by our Opponents at Augsburg.

"Article I. This article is correct, and admitted on our part, because it is founded on Scripture, and supported by the Ante-Nicene Councils. In this Article, the Princes very properly condemn the heresies, that oppose the doctrines taught in it.

Article II. This Article, too, we admit, but with this proviso, for sin, the want of the fear of God, and the want of faith, are actually sin.*

Article III. Is right, and agrees with the Scriptures, and with our Church also.

Article IV. Is also correct, when properly understood. For it is true that all our good works are of no account without the grace of God. Yet all merit is not to be excluded. For where there is a reward, there must also be merit.

Article V. Is right; the Anabaptists here are very properly condemned.

Article VI. Is not correct, in so far as it denies all merit in good works.

Article VII. That the Church is the congregation of those who believe, is not correct. This is an error, and was condemned at Constance, in the case of John Huss, and is contrary to the Scriptures, which compare the Church to a net, in which good and bad fish were taken.

Article VIII. Is right, inasmuch as it condemns the Donatists.

Article IX. Is all right. This is the Article on Baptism. It seems the Lutheran view was fully approved by the Romanists; they had not even a word of comment to make on it.

Article X. This too, is correct. Yet it should be taught how, or that the bread and wine cease to be bread and wine, and are converted into the body and blood of Christ. The Protestant Princes know, or ought to know that the true body and blood of Christ must be in either kind, otherwise it would be a dead body, and that would be

* Der 11 Artikel ist zugelassen, doch sonder angenehme Erylerung; Den die Sünde, Gott nicht fürchten, demselben nicht glauben, etc., wirkliche sünden sind.

contrary to Paul, when he says, "Death shall have no more dominion over him." Here we have a correct view of the difference between the doctrines of the Lutherans and Roman Catholic Churches, on the presence of the Lord Jesus in the Holy Supper. The Catholics believed with Paschasius Radbertus, that the bread was actually changed into the body and blood of Christ. This is Transubstantiation, a doctrine which the Lutheran Church has always rejected as unscriptural, unreasonable and absurd. But says, the man who does not understand our views on this point, your Church certainly teaches Consubstantiation, which is not very far removed from Transubstantiation. No, our Church never did, and does not now teach any such thing. Our most learned theologians from Luther down to the present day, teach that the Lord Jesus is present in the Holy Supper, not physically, nor merely spiritually, but that he is present in a manner incomprehensible to us, but nevertheless present. This we believe is taught in the Bible. This we call "*Unio sacramentalis*," a sacramental union, and by this very term, says one of our most learned theologians, "We acknowledge that we do not understand its meaning." Those, therefore, who charge us with believing in Consubstantiation, do us great injustice.

But to proceed with the Refutation.

Article XI. Is all right, only we would have all persons to confess all their sins.

Article XII. Repentance is not properly divided. Faith must precede repentance. Pope Leo X. has already condemned Luther's views on this subject. But we cannot go through the whole Refutation. It is a respectable document, but far inferior to the Confession. We now leave Spalatin, thanking him for the light we have received from his private journal. Let us turn to other sources and see what more was done at Augsburg. What became of the Confession, and what effect had this famous Refutation upon it, and upon the Diet. The Refutation was read before the Diet by Alexander Schweiss. Charles slept soundly while he was reading it. As soon as Schweiss had finished reading, the Count Palatine, who was the mouth-piece of Charles, and who before he could, possibly, have learned the views of the Emperor, proclaimed to the Diet, that the Emperor found this Refutation true, and in accordance with the teachings of the Church, and the Gos-

pel of Christ. He also required the Lutherans to abandon their Confession, which had now been so triumphantly refuted, and that they should receive the true doctrines of the Church, as set forth in this Refutation; if they did not, at once, give up the errors of their Confession, the Emperor would show them that he had the power and the will to compel them. But the Lutherans could not see things in that light. They did not acknowledge themselves beaten. They requested to be furnished with a copy of the Refutation. This the Speaker of the Diet said could not then be done. The Diet would have to weigh the matter well. For some days, the Refutation was withheld; at last the Count Palatinate said they should by the Emperor's consent, have a copy, but only on the conditions that they would not print or communicate it to others, that they would not reply to it, and that they should, at once, argue the point with the Emperor, and do as he desired. These were curious conditions. Pontanus said: The Papists present us with their Refutation, as the fox offered a thin broth to his gossip, the stork. The Lutherans refused to receive the Refutation on these terms. This gave great offence to the Diet, and words passed between the two parties; it was, indeed, feared, at one time, that the Catholics and Lutherans would come to blows, in the very presence of the Emperor. But some of the more moderate of both parties interfered, and quiet was, at length restored.

The war clouds were beginning to darken around the Lutheran Princes. On the 6th of July the Pope held a meeting in the Vatican with his Cardinals—the Lutheran Confession, which contained their *ultimatum* was laid before the Holy College, viz.: the cup for the laity, the marriage of the priests, the omission of the invocation of the saints in the sacrifice of the mass, and the convocation of a General Council. These things, said the sacred College, we cannot admit, for they are opposed to the discipline and canons of the Church. This settled the matter, so far as the Church was concerned.

The Legate, Cardinal Campeggio, said to Charles: "If these rebels, who are insensible to threats and promises, persist in their diabolical course, then let his Majesty seize fire and sword, let him take possession of all the property of the heretics, and utterly eradicate these venomous plants; then let him appoint holy inquisitors, who shall

go on the track of the remnant of the Reformed, and proceed against them as in Spain against the Moors; let him put the University of Wittenberg under the ban, burn the heretical books, and send back the fugitive monks to their convents." This was the merciless policy of Rome. But this was more easily said than done. The Turk was hanging on the outskirts of the German Empire. The prudent Elector of Saxony, with his powerful Saxon soldiers, might be needed, and the intrepid Philip of Hesse, one of the best commanders in Germany, could not be spared from the Emperor's army. Here was the difficulty. Every means was resorted to, to induce the Lutherans to acknowledge the Refutation, but all to no purpose; they were all as firm as the hills. Nothing could move them. Joachim, Duke of Brandenburg said, in an address before the Diet: "Your sentiments are contrary to the gospel. Abandon your errors. Do not remain separate from the Church any longer, sign the Refutation without delay. If you refuse, then, by your fault how many souls will be lost, how much blood shed, what countries laid waste; and you, he said, turning to the Elector of Saxony, your Electorate, your life, all will be torn from you, and certain ruin will fall upon you and your subjects." But the Elector was unmoved; his trust was in God.

On the 6th of August, Philip of Hesse left the city, without permission from the Emperor. This gave great alarm. The Emperor was much offended. Some of the cowardly Papal Princes were dreadfully alarmed with the apprehension that Philip had gone home for the purpose of raising an army to attack the Emperor. The warlike spirit of the Papal Princes died away, and they became mild and conciliatory. On the 16th of August, a mixed committee was appointed, consisting of Roman Catholics and Protestants, to endeavor to draw up articles that would be acceptable to both parties. This committee commenced their labors, taking the Confession and the Refutation as the ground-work of the new Confession; the theologians on the Papal side, were Drs. Eck, Wimpina and Cochläus; on the Lutheran side, Melancthon, Brenz and Schnepff, and it was most fortunate for the Lutherans, that Chancellor Pontanus was on this committee, for he was the most firm and steadfast man among them all. Melancthon was alarmed, and willing to yield almost everything. The Lutherans were even willing to admit

the supremacy of the Pope, but Pontanus would not consent. When Luther heard what was going on at Augsburg, he objected to the humiliating confessions his friends were making, at Augsburg. "Do not," says he, "yield the point; act with courage, and admit nothing but what can be proved from the Word of God." When Rome saw how willing the leaders of the Protestant cause were to give up all that had been thus far gained by the Reformation, the Romish party, especially the leader, Cardinal Campeggio, became insolent and arrogant, and declared that Rome would yield nothing to the heretics. This broke up the commission. Nothing was accomplished. Another committee was appointed, but with the like result. The different parties kept wrangling, until late in the fall, but nothing was done. The Lutherans left and immediately formed a league of defence, determined to maintain, at all hazards, the cause of Protestantism. Here the Church received a new impulse. From 1530 she may date her new spiritual life. Here she was built upon a solid foundation, and this enabled her to pass through the baptism of blood and fire, which soon after awaited her.

ARTICLE VII.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

By REV. JOHN S. CRUMBAUGH, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.*

The idea of a revelation presupposes something unknown, which is to be revealed. Nor is any reason given which would lead man to suppose that this will be complete, unless it be specially stated. Therefore in the revelation which God has given to man, of himself, and his relations to his creatures, we need not expect that all will be revealed, unless we have a promise to this effect. For this promise we search in vain, in the writings of the New

* Died January 13th, 1859, in the 28th year of his age. *Vide* Sketch of Mr. Crumbaugh, *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, Vol. XVII. p. 391.

Testament, or the Old. On the other hand, it expressly states, that we now see through a glass dimly, but that the Holy Spirit will take of the things of Christ and show them unto us. If a man comes to us bearing every testimony to his strict veracity, and promises to make a communication of some important facts to us, do we therefore presume that he will tell us all? If we do, we go farther than we have any right. And if among the facts revealed, there be some which, on account of our ignorance of the circumstances, we are not able to understand, shall we reject the whole as a tissue of falsehood? By no means. We would thankfully receive what facts he would impart, laying them up in our hearts, and patiently wait for the developments of time, or a future revelation. God promised to make a revelation to us of some important facts concerning himself, and ourselves, and this he has done. He did not promise to reveal all, for then there would have been no use for heaven, and no employment for eternity. As much as is best for us, he has set before us, and the rest he will teach us, as we are ready for the lessons. In revealing himself, as he has in part, of course there will be many things which are as yet but merely mentioned, and, hence, cannot be understood. In the coming volumes of his revelation, they will be developed and made to shine as clear as the sun. What he has set before us, we should humbly and thankfully receive, as the gift of a good God to his unworthy creatures.

But instead of doing this, man, in his vaulting ambition, presumes to dictate to Deity the proper limits where his oracles should cease, and to point out to Omniscience wherein it has failed to perform its part. And, most ungrateful of all, it labors to snatch up the God-like crown, which the Saviour laid aside—to accomplish our redemption and to make us partakers of the invisible things of God—and thus strives to rob him of his God-head. And for what reason? Simply because Christianity has not been made known, as they think it ought to have been, or because its teachings refuse to accommodate themselves to the narrow measurement of his mind. If reason is to be made the limit of truth and knowledge, surely our path would be a dark and gloomy one. It would be star-light all the while, to our souls. And yet, how often do men prefer to stumble on their uncertain way, guiding their steps by this dim light, rather than meekly to let the Sun

of Righteousness shine upon their souls. If we were to disbelieve everything we could not fully understand, we should doubt even our own existence. It is a deep mystery to us. How is it, that the simple act of willing is followed by the obedient muscles? The truth of this argument has been felt so forcibly, that some have been led insanely to deny their own existence, and to resolve everything into mere mental creation, rather than admit the mysteries of the Bible. We live in a world of mystery. We have not yet learned the alphabet of creation; unlettered, as yet untaught, in respect to ourselves, we presume to sit in judgment upon God. A little child will ask the wisest of us, in one hour, more questions than we can answer in a life-time.

The doctrine of Christ's Divinity is one of those which has been frequently and powerfully assaulted. The truth has been set aside, and, if it were possible, Christ's very historical existence would be denied. "The crown which flourishes on his head, however, is not to be torn away, nor the anchor of our hope to be wrested from us by the rude hand of licentious criticism." If there be one truth clearly taught in the Word of God, it is the Unity and Trinity of the God-head. The apostles, as if foreseeing the storm which would arise in the Christian Church, have given us the most explicit evidences on this subject.

The first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is a complete argument on this point. The holy intelligences of heaven are there summoned around the Council Board, but it is only to show how far they are below Him, who is the brightness of his Father's glory and the express image of his person. Angels, great in power and honor, are called up. But unto which of them said God at any time, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee, I will be to him a father and he shall be to me a son. Unto whom, triumphantly asks the apostle, Has he said at any time, Sit thou on my right hand: Let all the angels of God worship him. And, again, Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, oh God, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thus is the majesty of God powerfully set forth by the pen of inspiration.

To Christ, in the Bible, every attribute of Deity is ascribed. Is God eternal? As John solemnly introduces

the Saviour in the sublime opening verse of his Gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God," eternity is assuredly ascribed to the Redeemer, for he adds, "and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." Is God omnipresent? So is the Saviour. For he has said: "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And, again, "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The light of his countenance, at the same moment, gives light and joy to the circling angels in heaven, and is salvation and great gladness to the saints on earth. He is surrounded by the seraphim and cherubim, and yet he continues to walk amid the golden candlesticks of the Church. Who is with us continually; who meets with his saints everywhere? Who is with the humble saint in his closet, and the penitent king on the throne. Is God omnipotent? So is Jesus Christ. He is the beginning and the end, the Alpha and Omega, the Almighty. He stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth. Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb: I am the Lord that maketh all things—that stretcheth forth the heavens above, that spreadeth abroad the earth by himself. Ah, Lord God our Saviour, Behold thou hast made the heavens and the earth by thy great power and outstretched arm, and there is nothing too hard for thee. Oh the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and power of God; how unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out! Who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been his counsellor?

Is God our Preserver. So is Jesus Christ. Of him and through him, and in him, all things consist. Who is the Governor among the nations, having on his vesture, and on his thigh, a name written—King of kings and Lord of lords. The prophet exclaims, Awake, Oh sword, against my shepherd and against the man that is my fellow. Here he is distinctly characterized as God's *fellow*, his equal, his companion, his intimate friend. Isaiah calls him Emanuel, God with us. And the Psalmist says, David's son yet David's Lord. The mighty God, the true God, the great God our Saviour, God over all blessed for evermore, and in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. In the tenth chapter of John, the Saviour pleads his own cause. The Jews drew nigh and asked

him, How long wilt thou make us to doubt. If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered, I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because you are not of my sheep. My sheep know my voice and follow me. And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father who gave them to me, is greater than all. I and my Father are one.

Can any teaching be plainer than this. Yet even this is warped from its true meaning, in order that it may afford no evidence to the Lord's Divinity. To establish their point it is asserted, that this is only meant to signify the exalted state, to which the Saviour shall be raised by his connection with the Father, and the mutual interest they would feel in each other's concern; and in proof of it, they quote the prayer of Jesus, which he uttered before his death, and which invests and clothes all heaven and earth in a robe of divine glory—I pray for them that they may all be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one—I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. It is true, that if the Son had not commented upon the meaning of his language, a mere examination of texts might lead us to this conclusion. But he is here setting forth not a personal union, an absorption of the creature into the Creator, but by a strong *simile*, endeavoring to show how nearly we, as saints, should stand to God. Many passages of this kind are to be found in the Bible where, under cover of a figure, the truth is pressed closely home upon us. Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect. Of course no one is so made as even to anticipate divine perfection, yet as far as our earthly circumstances will permit, we must imitate the character of God. So, also, as far as our individual existence, and our imperfect nature, will permit, shall we be joined in communion and unity with God; and to make this as strong as possible, to set forth the Saviour's love in the strongest manner, he represents them as being one with him, for he is the head and we are the members, he is the vine and we are the branches; and if thus intimately joined with him, then are we also joined with the Father,

for they are one. To how noble a relationship are we here called. Oh that we could see how closely we are united to the Church above, and its great Bishop and Shepherd! We are all one body—the Church militant in all its branches, and the Church triumphant, in all its orders, and the crowning piece to the structure; the capstone in heaven, is the Son of God. When the Jews took up stones to stone him, he asked, For which of all my works do you stone me? If I do not the works of my Father, then believe me not. Here he appeals to his acts, also, as a proof of his divine origin.

Moses had wrought many miracles, but not in virtue of his own power; it was of the Lord. He trembled when it was told him, that he should stand before kings and show them wonders. The prophets were mighty men of the Lord, but all their acts were done in the power and strength of the Master, of whom they were the forerunners. But the Son came, and no longer needed the ministration of angels to accomplish his purposes, but spoke and it was done, commanded, and it stood fast. For all power was given unto him, in heaven and on earth. Some few of his miracles he wrought in virtue of his Mediatorial office, but most of them as Lord himself. To the palsied he said, "Be whole again," to the dead, "Arise," to the leprous, "Be clean," to the blind, "See," to the lame, "Walk," to the winds, "Be still," to the waves, "Peace." Nature and hell heard and knew their Sovereign's voice. Devils hastened from their long possessions and fled at the sound of his footsteps. Thus, if complete control of the elements, of diseases, of men and of spirits, of the worlds above, of angels, can prove Christ's Divinity, then he is Divine.

Again, the first commandment is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." If Jesus Christ be not God, then the New Testament teaches blasphemy, for it commands us to serve him. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son. That all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that sent him. And again, he is not only to be revered as God, by men, but, says the voice of inspiration, "Let all the angels of God worship him." God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus

every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." These are plain injunctions of the worship of the Saviour, and yet in the face of all these, men will presume, sometimes, to deny him his due praise. In the Bible we have a number of instances in which distinguished and holy men have glorified him in their service. We read of the ancient patriarch who was sitting by his tent at eventide in the plains of Mamre, and lo, three men stood before him. One of these the aged father calls Lord, and worships him, and, again he is named as Jehovah, whilst the other two are called angels. This was Christ, for no one can see the Father and live. Moses offered sacrifice to the Angel-Jehovah, who appeared to him, and Isaiah praises him in the language of the seraphim, "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Jehovah of Hosts;" St. Stephen, in his dying moments, when the world was darkening on his earthly vision, exclaimed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." How interesting an evidence of his worthiness, to see one of his saints, the proto-martyr, committing his eternal all into the hands of the Saviour, in whom he believed. It is said that, sometimes, as the body falls to decay, stray light from eternity enters the crumbling tabernacle, and sheds strange knowledge over the soul. If so here, it only leads to a more perfect confidence in the Saviour. St. Paul repeatedly prays to him. Yea, almost all of his prayers are directed to him: "Now may the Lord direct your hearts to the love of God and the patience of Christ." Thus he prayed. Also our Baptismal rite assumes the Divinity of the Saviour, and our benedictions—May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen! In fine, are we to believe that the Jews acted rightly in putting Jesus to death, that Judas is in heaven for having brought to punishment an arrant blasphemer? For if he were not the Lord, then, assuredly, he was one of the most abandoned and wicked impostors the world has ever known? Are we to believe, too, that all those who have died already, relying upon his divine mission, have been deceived and are now reaping the rewards of their impiety. That, trusting in him, they entered the dark portals of eternity, and winged their flight, joyously, to the Heavenly Hill,

but found the gates barred and locked; that he, in whom they had trusted, was not an inmate there, but a companion of the damned, whither they were directed to join company? Believe this, who can. As for us, we will hold on to the faith, once delivered unto the saints.

If we have established the Divinity of our Saviour, what, then, is our duty toward him. There are two ways of denying Christ,—one by argument, the other by act. It is in vain for a person to say he believes in the Redeemer, and yet continues to live in sin. The man who really believes in a descended God, will rush at once to acknowledge him in his works and ways to the mercy-seat. It is mere pretence to say I believe, and yet continue in sin. An historical faith there may be, but not a saving faith. The devils believe and tremble, but devils do not love the Saviour. If we are rejecting the mission of the Son, let us beware, lest the Father also reject us and spurn us from his presence. Whoso loveth me, loveth the Father, and whoso rejecteth me, him will the Father also reject. And what is it to be rejected of God? It is hell! If we are Christians, then, let us rejoice that we are led on by so mighty a Captain. Hitherto he has been the strong arm of the Church. Supreme in heaven and in earth, upholding all things by the word of his power, the universe is the magazine of his means. Whilst he is our stronghold, our rock of defence, we need fear no evil. In past ages the Church has been cruelly assailed. The enemies of truth have striven to blot out every memorial of hope. The blood of her sons and her daughters have flowed like streams. The faggot has been lighted, the stake set up, and the smoke of their burnings rolled in thick volumes to the sky. At times they have triumphed over her defections and her woes. They have built monumental piles upon her supposed ruins. But what has become of the Church. Let another answer: "She rose from her ashes, fresh in beauty and in might. Celestial glory beamed around her; she dashed down the monumental marble of her foes, and they who hated her fled before her. She has celebrated the funeral of kings and kingdoms, who plotted her destruction. The day of triumph is coming. Soon we shall call her walls salvation, and gates praise.

ARTICLE VIII.

ARTICLE SECOND OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.*

ORIGINAL SIN.

By SAMUEL SPRECHER, D.D., President of Wittenberg College,
Springfield, Ohio.

The subject of the second Article of the Augsburg Confession, is one of the most important and difficult within the whole range of theological thought. The connection of the fall of Adam with the universality of sin in his posterity, though always shrouded in mystery for human speculation, will never lose its practical bearing upon human conduct.

* The Confession itself, is the expression of a renewed experience of the great facts of sin and grace—a re-assertion of the cardinal doctrines of the gospel. The statements in this Article are evidently made in the interest of the great subject of gratuitous justification, and sanctification through the mediation of the blessed Saviour and the agency of the Holy Spirit. Luther was led, by personal experience, down into the depths of consciousness, where the thoughts accuse, or excuse, one another, and up to the heights of divine light, where the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness of men. The sinfulness and condemnation, the helpless guilt, and hopeless depravity of man, were to him facts of consciousness; the freeness and fulness of the divine salvation, matters of personal experience. As his experience was of the same marked kind with that of Augustine, so is there a similarity between his Anthropological views and those of this distinguished father in the Church. And as the Reformation started from a practical point of view, so is the Augsburg Confession a practical expression of the cardinal doctrines involved in this great spiritual revolution of Christendom.

* Second Lecture, on the "Holman Foundation," delivered August 6th, 1867, before the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa.

The Papacy had appropriated the Ecclesiastical errors of Augustine and the Anthropological errors of Pelagius. The scholastic theology had degenerated into the superstition of the Augustinian Ecclesiasticism, and the scepticism of the Pelagian Anthropology—the mere *opus operatum* of the one, and the mere external morality of the other. The Reformers rejected the errors of both; but they adopted the great fundamentals of the Augustinian Anthropology. A deep consciousness of sin, led Luther to receive the doctrine of organic connection with Adam in the fall; to pronounce natural depravity a positive corruption of human nature, an inborn enmity to God; to ascribe to man, as the consequence of it, an entire impotency to the divine life, a helpless exposure to the divine wrath—and from it, as the root, to derive all other sins. Hence the Augsburg Confession describes the state into which men, by natural propagation, are born, as the want of the fear of God, and of confidence in God, and the presence of evil lust (*concupiscentia*); and regards this mass of corruption, as really sin, on account of which, all who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost, are condemned, and liable to eternal punishment.

The Article requires attention to the *origin, the contents, the character, the consequences*, of this sin.

1. The origin of it, is clearly indicated in the name by which they designate it: *Peccatum Originis—Erbsünde*. By this they mean the one original sin—the sin of origin—the inherited sin—the sin transmitted to us with the human nature—the sin received with the origin of our being. In teaching the fundamental doctrine of the Latin Anthropology, they naturally use the words of Augustine, by whom it received its full enunciation. Pelagius said, that all good and evil—all praise-worthiness or blame—worthiness is in actual sin—is in actual obedience or transgression; sin, therefore, cannot come by birth, but only from acts of free-will. Adam could not originate sin, once for all; but each individual sinner must originate the first sin in his own case—the first sin of the human nature which is in him. Augustine, on the contrary, said, that Adam, in his free, self-determination, had, by one sin—a peculiar sin—a sin which only the Protoplast, the First Man, could commit—a sin which could never have been committed by any of his successors in human nature—a sin which could not be repeated even by himself—a sin of which his sub-

sequent acts of transgression, and the sins of other men, are only manifestations and developments;—had, by this one act, corrupted the human nature which was in his person, and which is in all the individuals of his posterity. It is, therefore, *Peccatum Originis—Erbsuende*—the first sin in the world, the first sin in every man; the sin inherited from Adam, by every individual man, naturally engendered “since the fall.” By *Peccatum Originis* they point to the mode and character of the origin of individual men, since the fall, as distinguished from that *Justitia Originis*, with which the individual Adam, and the human nature which was in him, came originally from the hand of God; the former, by generation, from the sinful Adam; the latter, by creation, from the holy God—the one sinful, the other holy. This sin did not begin with the origin of the human nature itself in creation. Man, generically, and individually, was created holy; human nature, as a species, was created holy, and it was good, as it existed in individuals by creation; Adam was created righteous, and Eve was created pure, out of the holy, human nature which was in Adam. The Confessors would distinguish, with Augustine, between substance and quality in human nature; regarding the former, as coming from the immediate agency of God; the latter, as resulting from the free act of man—would, with the framers of the Formula of Concord, at a later day, have declared original sin an accident, inseparable, indeed, during the period, between the sinful birth, on earth, and the holy glorification, in heaven, but still only an accident to human nature, and not a constituent element of its substance. Hence they do not call it *Peccatum naturale*, nor *Peccatum nature*, but *Peccatum Originis*. They refer not to the mere fact of the possession of the common human nature; for that being the result of creation, is good; nor to the mere fact of the possession of an individual human nature, for this, also, is a pure creation of God in the first individuals; but to the manner in which, since the fall, all men become partakers of the common human nature, and receive their individual being—to the fact, that all men naturally engendered, since the fall, spring not by creation, but by birth from the human nature which, in, and through, Adam apostatized, after it had been created in righteousness and true holiness. This is the *Peccatum Originis*, the beginning and the

source of all sin. This distinction is made still more clear by the phrase, "Since the fall of Adam"—no sin in created man *before*; nothing but sin, in the generated man, while unregenerate, *after*. It is, indeed, *Peccatum Originis—Erbsuende*—for it is inherited—received at the moment of our origin—received with nature, not merely in connection with nature, or without the corruption of nature, but in such a way, that it is inherent in our nature. We received it, from our progenitors; they, from theirs, and so on, back through all generations, until we come to Adam, who inherited nothing, and especially no sin; for he had neither father nor mother; was created, and created holy. Adam could not inherit sin from Him who made him; for God would not originate sin, and he could not create it. Man, the free creature, could, and, by an act of self-determination, did originate sin, and entailed it, with its consequence, death, upon all his children. They are heirs, and it is the sin in which he involved himself and the entire human nature which was in him; that is the deplorable heritage which they all have received. "Since the fall, all men naturally engendered, are born in sin; they do not and cannot originate sin; only Adam could originate it, and only by that one sin. Not from the state of the human nature, before the fall, which Adam received holy from the hand of creation, which he should have propagated holy, and which, but for that one sin, he would have propagated holy; not from the state of the human nature, in which men would have been, if Adam had not fallen; but in consequence of the state of the human nature: "Since the fall of Adam, all men, naturally engendered, are begotten and born in sin;" have inherited from that original progenitor, an "inherent disease and natural depravity; are full of evil lust and inclination, destitute of true fear of God, and of true faith in him;" and are immutably fixed in this lamentable condition, until haply, they "are born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost."

2. What are the contents of this original sin—this inherited depravity?

The Confessors present these in a positive and a privative form. They distinguish between something inhering in man, which he ought not to have, and something which he ought to have, but which he has not. Positively, they say: "All men from their birth are full of evil lust and

inclination (*concupiscentia*);" privatively; "They can, by nature, have no true fear of God, and no true confidence in him."

Let us notice first the positive, in the material of natural depravity. By *Lust und Neigung* in the German, and *Concupiscentia*, in the Latin copy, they do not mean any actual sins, either in thought, feeling or action; but something back of these, and which is their source. They here again call attention to the one original and originating sin. To us, it seems strange, that these words should generally have been translated as if, in the original, they were used in the plural, instead of the singular number. They do not mean any individual and constitutional desires of human nature (for these were originally bestowed in creation); nor the perverted and polluted exercise of these propensities, as distinguishable and separable from the *Lust, Neigung* or *Concupiscentia*; but the perverted and polluted exercise of these desires and propensities, as invariably the result of that innate depravity, which they designate particularly, by the use, in the singular number, of each and all of these words. They mean that the normal state of man is, to have the power and the exercise of the power to fear and trust God, and to keep all the faculties and impulses of his nature in a state of obedience to the divine Law—and that in his depravity he has lost this power. In his original state, he possessed and exercised it; and though the possession and exercise of it were gifts of the creative hand, yet was it, a free power and a free exercise. Adam was most free in his most perfect obedience; but as he was free, he could, in his own self-determination, lose this power to control his constitutional appetites and desires, and to love and fear his God; and the act, by which he would lose it, would also induce a sinful and ruling inclination, as a permanent source of the sinful exercise of all his constitutional faculties and susceptibilities. To such an inherent depravity, which has taken the place of the holy disposition with which man was created, they refer in the use of the words *Lust, Neigung, Concupiscentia*. Hence, when their Romish opponents undertook to construe this Article, so as to make these words mean particular and individual evil desires—which are actual sins; they declare, in the Apology, that it is a *false interpretation* of the meaning of the words of the Article; when their opponents say: "That to be without the fear

of God, and without faith in Him, is a charge of actual sins;" and appeal to the German copy to show that they deny: "To all who are born according to the sensual nature, not only the exercises, but the ability—the gift to produce, &c." "We say, namely, that man so born, has the evil inclination, and cannot produce, &c." "In this sense, the Latin also denies to nature, the capacity, that is the gift and power to effect, &c." "As by the expression evil desire, we mean not only effects or fruits; but a perduring inclination of nature." "These are the reasons why, in the description of original sin, we both mentioned the evil inclination, and denied to the natural powers of man, fear and confidence towards God. We wished to call attention to the facts, that original sin embraces all these, ignorance of God, contempt of God, want of fear before God, and of confidence towards him—the *inability* to love God." "The same thing lies in the definition of Augustine, who is in the habit of so defining original sin, as to make it the *evil inclination*" * * which "*came in, after the loss of righteousness.*"

They evidently mean something different from a natural faculty or constitutional tendency, which comes from the creative hand. Something, which man could superinduce upon his constitution, and which he did superinduce, in the Fall, something, consequently, which is blameworthy and not indifferent, as would be a normal susceptibility or infirmity: hence, they say, in the Apology: "Augustine has refuted * * the opinion * * that this inclination is no fault in man; but rather something morally indifferent, as we call bodily pain or sickness *adiaphorom*." From this, it is clear, that, though the distinction between the spiritual and the organic or constitutional in man was not then, as fully, in consciousness, or in science as it is, at this day, they yet meant by *Concupiscentia*, Lust, *Neigung*, a spiritual inclination which, being sinful, vitiates all the thoughts, feelings and actions of men. Hence, they could consistently declare, that acts good in themselves, when performed by unregenerate men, were destitute of true virtue. We have many actual desires, and these, under the influence of original sin, are actual sins; but they are not the *Concupiscentia*—the natural depravity. This is a different kind of lust, a lust which excites in us all kinds of lusts. In point of permanency, indeed, it is like these constitutional desires; like the animal appetites, it may

not always be in consciousness, though always present. As the immoderate and sinful appetites for food and drink, in the glutton and the drunkard, or the immoderate and sinful desires for property, in the miser and the spendthrift, reveal their permanency by the invariability of their excitement on the presentation of their objects; so a disposition or inclination, to that which is forbidden by the Divine law, lies back of all the thoughts, feelings and actions of men, and manifests its permanence, as a source of motive, by the universality of human sinfulness. The Confessors say consequently, in the Apology: "We speak of an inborn evil disposition of the heart, not of actual guilt and sin—for we say, that, in all the children of Adam, there is an evil lust and inclination:" that is, one comprehensive inclination to all that which is contrary to the law of God. In this sense also, they supply the word "full." As we say of a glutton or a drunkard, he is full of the desire for food or drink meaning, that this desire monopolizes the action of all his faculties; so when they say that all men in the state of natural depravity are *full* of evil lust and inclination, they mean that there is in them a full source of motive, an exhaustless fountain of evil impulses so vitiating all the actions of all the faculties of mind and body, that all the desires of man which should go out after God and spiritual good, tend to nothing but the transgression of God's law and the pursuit of all evil. It is an abiding disposition producing a governing purpose against holiness, and for sin.

But the confessors pass from a positive to a privative view of the contents of original sin. They say, that: "Since the fall of Adam all men naturally engendered, were born without fear of God or confidence towards him;" that is, there is not only the presence of sin, but the absence of holiness. This they treat as a real want. Now a real want consists not simply in the absence of a thing; but in the absence of a thing which should be present. The destitution of the fear of God and of confidence toward him, is not simply the absence of something; but the absence of something that should be present in man. They speak consequently, not merely negatively; but privatively. The normal condition of man demands the presence of that which is now absent, by birth, from the souls of all men. The absence of the fear of God and of confidence in him, from an irrational animal is not

a real want, because the presence of them is not required by the normal state of its being: but in a rational being it is such, because without the presence of these qualities he is not what he is required, by his entire constitution and all his relations, to be. This destitution is, as real a departure from the original and proper state of man, as would be the absence of reason. As a spiritual being, he must, as necessarily, have the exercise of divine fear and confidence in order to be what he ought to be, as he must possess reason, in order to be what he ought to be. Though the power and the exercise of the power, to be in this condition is free, yet he cannot be created without the immediate presence of both; because such is the nature of his being and relations, that he cannot properly be in a state, of either opposition or indifference toward God. There may not properly elapse, a single moment, from his creation without his fearing and trusting God; it is a quality inseparable from the proper state of his being, to be determined from the very beginning for God and right—he must be created, if he is to have being at all, in righteousness and true holiness. Men ought to fear God and trust him—should have and should exercise this inclination—should have both natural and moral ability to do this, they had it in their first estate, they should have it now, and as they have it not, they are in a state of the greatest possible want. This aspect of the subject the Confessors present especially, in contrast with prevalent Romish views. “This we have added, says the Apology, viz: that there was wanting divine fear and faith” * * because the scholastic teachers represent the natural depravity as less than it really is. * * “When they speak of the original (first) sin, they conceal the important wants of the human nature, or the absence of reverence and confidence toward God, and the presence of hatred to the government of God, terror at the justice of God, anger against God, despair of God’s favor, reliance upon things visible, &c.” These are the principal wants of human nature. * * “Men according to the original righteousness (the state of innocence) have not only an equable temperament of the body; but also these gifts, viz: a certain knowledge of God, reverence toward him, confidence in him, at least, uprightness, and the power to do it.” * * “Hence, the old explanation, when it says, that original sin is the destitution of righteousness, denies to

man, not only the obedience of the lower powers; but also knowledge of God, fear, &c., or, at least, the power to produce these" * * "Paul speaks expressly of original sin, as a want." * * "Easily will the reader now perceive that to be without the true fear of God and without true faith in him, is not merely to be guilty of actual sins; for these are *abiding wants* in human nature, as long as it is not renewed (regenerated.)"

3. But equally important is the doctrine of the Confessors, concerning the character of original sin. They declare that this inherent disease and natural depravity is *really* sin, not only called sin, but is sin, in the strictest sense. They seem simply to have asked: What does the divine law require, and what is natural depravity, and the answer from conscience and the Bible, being: It is a want of conformity to that which man ought to be, they conclude that it is *really* sin; that it properly bears the name, and truly possesses the character, of sin. To the objection that this would represent man himself as sin, because it shows him to be, in his nature, and by birth, against the law of God; they would answer, that is not properly man, as to the substance of his nature, but as to a quality inhering in his nature—a quality acquired since creation, though present at generation and birth; not man, according to his normal constitution, but in his fallen state; not by his original nature, but by an accident invariably adhering to him, is he contrary to God's law. With them, it was a practical thing—a dreadful, but unquestionably fact. And, hence, in the Apology, they confidently appeal to the inner consciousness of every man, and to the revealed Word of God; assured that the response will be that there is a permanent inner source of sin, in all men, from the first moment of their being; and that this sinful inclination is really contrary to God's law, is *really* sin.

In order to appreciate fully this declaration of the Confessors, we must look at the state of things, in view of which it was made. All, with the exception of the Pelagians, agreed that natural depravity is an evil; but it was a question whether it is properly called *sin*—sin, in the strict sense—sin, in the sense of guilt. The idea of the Greek Anthropology, that original sin, being merely a propagated physical corruption, and, consequently, not, in the strict sense, sin—culminated in Pelagianism. This extreme went down un-

der the weight of Augustinianism; but the old idea, in the form of Semi-Pelagianism, and, at last, under the name of Augustinianism; but with a preponderating tendency to the side of Pelagianism; became the predominant Anthropology of the Papal Church.

This system taught, that original righteousness did not belong to man's normal condition—was not a gift of creation, but a gift of grace; not a natural endowment, but a *donum super-additum*. It agreed with Pelagianism, that man, by creation, was neither holy nor sinful; but it said that he was made holy by a gift, superadded to the gifts of creation. He was originally neither positively righteous, nor positively unrighteous—was in *puris naturalibus*; his soul, in its immortal aspirations, going out after spiritual good; his body, with its carnal appetites craving sensual gratification—to check the conflict, to maintain the proper balance, to give to the higher powers their appropriate dominion, in his nature—he was endowed with a super-added gift, not of creation, but by grace. In his fall, therefore, he lost no natural gift; he simply returned to his original state. Some, it is true, distinguished, only in idea, between the state in *puris naturalibus*, and that of the *donum super-additum*, and regarded the act of creation in the one, and the act of grace in the other, as co-etaneous in the perfection of man in original righteousness; and, consequently, sin, as reigning among men, since the fall, not only as a consequence of the *concupiscentia*, but as inherited. But the great majority, with their high estimate of the powers of man, would not, even in this sense, admit an original sin; but ascribed to the fall of Adam only the consequence, that his posterity are punished for his sake. The *justitia originalis*, and the *pura naturalia*, were to be distinguished, not only ideally, but actually, and the former regarded as coming to the latter, only at a later period, as *donum super-additum*. The *justitia originalis* is lost, indeed, by the sin of Adam, but in such a way and manner, that the human nature suffers no change, or harm; the *concupiscentia* has, indeed, been deprived of the rein by which it was, before restrained and guided; but it is not itself sin, and is only stimulated, and that not positively, but only privatively, to crave the sensual and the agreeable. The sin of Adam consists in the loss of the holiness and righteousness received as a super-added gift, in a weakened and oppressed will, and in the tenden-

cy of the *Concupiscentia*, itself innocent, to lead to sin, and consequently, punishment and death. The sin of Adam bears the same relation to posterity, that the crime of a rebel in political society does to his innocent children—where not only the guilty father, but the innocent children are for the father's sake, sometimes, the subjects of punishment. If a prince should put his livery upon a naked peasant, with the promise, that he and his posterity should always wear it, if he behaved well: the loss of the livery, on transgression, would simply leave the peasant, and his children after him, in the same condition in which he was before he had this gift, and in which they would have been, if he had never received it. So the subject Adam, in sinning against the Great King, lost the livery of heaven, in which he was clothed by the *donum superadditum*, and is left, with the children which he has propagated, *in puris naturalibus*. The depravity of the human heart is not original sin, in whole or in part; but is only a punishment of it; it is neither *good nor bad*, and not *properly speaking, sin*—is only called sin, in the sense that, if not resisted, the consequence is sin. Man was originally created with this inclination, and that it did not operate in Adam before the fall, resulted not from the fact that it was not in him; but because it was held in check by that supernatural grace—the *donum super-additum*.

This was the prevalent Papal Anthropology, at the period of the Reformation; and it was especially upheld by Bishops Ambrosius Catharinus and Albertus Pighius. These men, in books published against Luther, maintained that there is *nothing in man since the fall*, which does not belong to the *essential* human nature—the *pura naturalia*; that the consequence of Adam's sin is *solely the imputation* of the Fall. Fresh and lively in his sense of sin, and of pardoning grace, it was the lot of Luther to meet this great error. No wonder that it led him to make special efforts to revive the true doctrine of original sin, and to insist upon the depth and guilt of natural depravity. No wonder that he would bring out anew the doctrine of Augustine, that the natural and normal state of man's being, as he came from the creative hand, necessarily included original righteousness; that man was made by the Creator what he ought to be; that he could not have been what he ought to be, without original righteousness; and

that this gift of righteousness could not be superadded to the gifts of creation ; for that would imply a period, even before the Fall, during which, he was not what he ought to be. No wonder that he should reject even the doctrine of the Greek Anthropology—that original sin being merely a propagated physical corruption, and consequently, involuntary—is *not sin*, in the sense of guilt—and agree with the Latin Anthropology, that original sin is not only in the lower and sensuous, but also in the higher and spiritual, powers, that, it is voluntary in the sense of *self-will*, and consequently is *really sin*, that even infants are guilty ; because they possess not merely a corrupt, sensuous nature, but a sinful bias of will.

In this work the Confessors join, and declare that this depravity is *really sin*. "The scholastic teachers declare," says the Apology : "That nothing is sinful which is not done of free-will. These principles hold with philosophers concerning human government ; but they do not hold under the Divine Government." The state, they would say, deals with man as he is, because she has received him as he is ; having received him, with this inability, she has no right to require what he is not now able to perform ; but the Divine Government deals with him as he ought to be ; having received him holy ; his present inability being his own production ; having freely lost the ability with which he was primarily gifted, and which he had, when he became the subject of the Divine Government ; he is under obligation to possess the original righteousness, and, consequently, all his sins, both original and actual, are guilt. Their opponents, they say : "Do not regard the evil inclination, as *really sin*, not as a fault or corruption of the nature of man ; but only as a servitude or a condition of mortality, to which all the posterity of Adam are subject, on account of the fault of another. * * It is, as when slaves are born of a slave-woman, and come into a servile condition, without any *fault of their nature* ; but through the *misfortune* of their mother. * * They speak of it as an evil *stimulant* (*fomes*), as a *particular quality of the body*, and in order, as usual, to be childish, they have raised the question ; Whether this particular quality of the body is derived from eating the apple (*Contagio Pomi*), or from the breath of the serpent ; whether it is made worse by medicine, &c." * * They maintain that this inclination is punishment Luther says : "It is *certainly sin*." After quoting passages of Scripture ; the

Confessors draw the conclusion from what they regard as infallible testimony: "That evil inclination *is sin*; which though not imputed to those who are in Christ, yet, in its nature *deserves death*."

And this according to the Confessors, is the lamentable condition of the whole family of Adam. *All men* naturally engendered are in this state of sin and guilt—not even excepting the blessed Virgin. Nor would they have agreed with the Calvinistic doctrine, that the children of the elect were members of the kingdom of God by birth; but declare that *all men* naturally engendered, whether born of regenerate or unregenerate parents, whether infants or adults, are born in sin, and that this inherent disease and natural depravity *is sin*, and still *condemns* and *causes eternal death* to all those who are not born again by Baptism and the Holy Ghost. They do not mean that unbaptized infants are lost; they speak only of God's revealed order, and while they do say that he binds us to this order, they do not imply that he binds himself by it. They had not forgotten that John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb—that the dying thief entered unbaptized into Paradise—that when Jesus had said, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he added not, he that believeth not and is not baptized shall be damned; but simply, he that believeth not shall be damned—that he said, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye cannot enter the kingdom of God—that it is not the will of the Father, that one of these little ones should perish. Not the unavoidable deprivation of Baptism, but the wilful neglect of it, condemns. Nor is the doctrine of some so-called Old Lutherans of our day, that the faith which precedes Baptism, is not yet saving, in accordance with the views of these first Lutherans, in the early days of the Reformation. I need not say, therefore, that the Confessors do not mean that God has no other way or means of regeneration, except those revealed in the Bible, or that unbaptized infants from the mere absence or want of Baptism, are unregenerated, and dying in infancy, are unprepared for heaven. They speak only of the revealed order of salvation, the way into which the Gospel calls us, and in which those who hear the Gospel have the only sure warrant and certain pledge of regeneration. To subjects who have not the Gospel, or are incapable of receiving it, this declara-

tion does not refer. For aught it teaches, all infants baptized or unbaptized may be regenerated and saved. But if regenerated and saved, they are regenerated and saved by the grace of God alone. Sad picture of the state of man—human nature like a great giant mortally diseased, in every part, limb and organ; no one member able effectually to help another—the leprous hand cannot minister to the diseased heart; the disordered heart cannot send a healthful life-current through the veins of the perishing members of the great body.

But whence this universality of human depravity? The Confessors say men are *born* with it. The Pelagians said, it is by the influence of example, and the power of habit; the Confessors, men are born in sin. The Pelagians said, the only connection between the sin of Adam and the sins of his posterity, is the connection between example and imitation; the Confessors, it is an organic connection. The Pelagians said, the only power, by which sin controls the powers of man, is the force of habit; the Confessors, it is the result of being born a member of a fallen race. The Romanists said, all men come into this condition, because, according to the order of God, it is a punishment—*per modum reatus per debiti*; the Confessors, all men are born in sin, and this natural depravity is *really* sin.

What is their explanation of this awful fact? Have they a philosophy of this inborn sin, as guilt? Was the conception of natural depravity, as, in the proper sense, sin, sustained, in their mind, by any particular theory concerning the origin of the human soul? With the exception of the Pelagians, all were agreed, that natural depravity is transmitted by propagation from Adam; but the question was, whether it is merely inherited *evil*, or whether it is inherited *sin*, in the proper sense of the word. It has been supposed by some, that, as the Confessors declared, that it is not merely *physical* corruption, but *moral* pollution, involving not only the *lower*, but the *higher* powers of man, that it is the mere result of being *naturally engendered*, and that it is *really* sin; they must have relied, much, upon the Traducian theory of the origin of the soul. This is inferred, partly, from the fact that this theory is very favorable to their doctrine of original sin, and partly from the fact, that it was afterward explicitly adopted, by the Formula of Concord, and soon became the

prevalent theory in the Lutheran Church. But though this theory may, possibly, be logically involved in their views of natural depravity, I doubt whether they were much influenced by it, or by anything, except their deep sense of sin, and their humble submission to the decisions of the Word of God, regarding the character and condition of fallen man. They appeal to experience, and, in the Apology, challenge their opponents to show them, in all history, a single man who ever dared to say, that, what they described natural depravity to be, viz.: "Want of fear of God, &c., was not sin;" but they do not appeal for support, to any theory of the origin of the soul. Luther was a Trichotomist, as well as a Traductionist; but as the former could not prevent him from rejecting the conclusion drawn from the Trichotomy, viz., that only the corporeal and animal, and not the spiritual, was affected by the Fall; so we may conclude, that he was not influenced by the latter, in favor of the Augustinian view of original sin. Besides, we are told on good authority, that he was unwilling to decide the question between the Traductionists and Creationists of the day. From this we may infer, that, though the Confessors were Traductionists, they were not influenced by the theory, as were many Lutherans, at a later day. So far as logical consequences are concerned, there is, indeed, a great difference in the bearings of the several hypotheses concerning the origin of the soul. The theory of pre-existence, regarding corporeal nature, as a prison-house of souls, and each individual body, as a prison-cell, into which an individual soul has descended for discipline; is obliged to say rather, that sin is brought by the soul from another state of being, than that it comes by propagation of the body, from the first man. Creationism, recognizing species only for the body, and pure individuality for the soul, organic connection with Adam, for the origin of the body, but pure creation for that of the soul, would, certainly, in the absence of any other considerations, deny that natural depravity is *really* sin. From the early Greek fathers, down to our day, those who rejected this doctrine, have, generally, been believers in the theory of Pre-existence, or that of Creation. Augustine himself, influenced by reason, or the general prevalence of Creationism, might hesitate to reject it; and Calvinistic can, more readily than Lutheran believers in the guilt of original sin, adopt it; for the for-

mer have, and the latter have not, relief from a supposed divine fore-ordination of sin and guilt in man. Creationists may, consistently with their theory, be among the foremost, in the belief of the universality and the depth of human depravity; nay, be led, by the theory, to peculiarly strong views of the guilt of all sin; but to the belief of inherited sin, in the sense of *guilt*, they must be led by other reasons and influences. But Traducianism, regarding all souls as present in the human nature, held in the person of Adam when he fell, is, by logical necessity, led to the conclusion, that natural depravity is guilt. If all souls were potentially present, then, when he sinned, they sinned, and, as the sin was voluntary, it is guilt. Creationism *admits a mediate* connection; Traduction *affirms an immediate* connection between the sinning Adam and the sinning human family. Creationism does not *deny the possibility*, or even *probability* that the created soul, connected with the propagated body, may sin before birth; Traduction *affirms the absolute certainty* of the soul's having sinned before birth. Creationism *may be led*, by experience and the Word of God, to the conclusion, that natural depravity, as real sin, existed in us before our birth; Traduction, *independently* of all other reasons, would infer this. Creationism *may admit*, that the fall of Adam has produced in us that which is an *invariable occasion* of our being born with a depravity, which is really sin; Traduction *positively affirms*, that it is a *necessary cause* of it—that it has introduced, not only an occasion, but a *necessity* of our coming into being sinful and guilty. Creationism *may admit* a natural ability, while it denies any moral ability in the human soul, to avoid sin—that it had the power to avoid sin, while there was a moral certainty that it would not; Traduction *must deny* both *natural and moral* ability to every human being naturally engendered, since the fall of Adam. But the Confessors rely upon no theory, and attempt no explanation; they consult conscience, and find that this depravity is *really* sin. They listen to the voice of experience, and learn that it has been their sin from their earliest recollection, that its origin was prior to consciousness, that, in all probability, they were born with it—born in sin—*born sinful and guilty*. They inquire at the oracles of God, and they think they hear the solemn response: “You were shapen in iniquity, and in sin did your mother conceive you;”

and they state the awful fact of universal depravity and universal guilt—the awful fact: “That since the fall of Adam, all men naturally born, are begotten and born in sin; that is, that they are, from the first moment of their existence, full of evil desire and propensity, and can, by nature, have no true fear of God, no true faith in God; and that this inherent disease and natural depravity is *really* sin.”

4. And this leads us, in the last place, to consider the consequences of this natural depravity. Is there any escape from this deplorable condition? The Article answers: “It still condemns and causes eternal death to all those who are not born again of Baptism and the Holy Ghost.” The Pelagians said: If man sin, he needs only the guiding light of truth, and the motive power of rewards and punishment for renovation; while his honest endeavors will secure the help of divine grace, to facilitate the work; still he is saved, not by the merits and sufferings, but by the teaching and example, of Christ. The Confessors say: “We condemn the Pelagians and others, who deny that original corruption is sin, and who, to the disparagement of the merits and sufferings of Christ, allege that man, by his natural abilities, may be justified before God.” These others were the Romanists. In the Apology stating the Papal doctrine, that: “Men can love God supremely, and keep his commandments;” they ask: “Is not this to have original righteousness? If the human nature have such great powers, that it can, of itself, love God supremely, what has become of original sin? For what purpose do we need the grace of Christ, if we can be justified by our own righteousness? To what end, do we need the Holy Ghost, if the human powers can, of themselves, love God and keep his commandments?” Man is lost, unless God save him; he can have neither merit nor strength for salvation; deliverance from this state, is entirely by divine grace and by divine agency;—entirely through regeneration by baptism and the Holy Ghost—it is entirely monergistic. The Greek Anthropology said: The human will, unaffected by the Fall, can begin the work of regeneration, but, on account of the hindrances of depravity, it needs divine grace to complete it; there are two efficient agencies; the work is a synergism. Pelagianism said: Man has suffered no change, by the Fall; he still has his destiny in his own hands; man is the only efficient

agent necessary in the production of holiness; salvation is monergistic. The Latin Anthropology said: The will of man has, by the fall, been determined to evil and fixed in enmity to God; the work of regeneration must, therefore, begin by divine agency, and, as the alienation from God, and the hostility to God's government, can cease only with the completion of the change, there can be no human co-operation; God is the only agent; man but the passive subject; there is complete and exclusive monergism in human salvation. The Greek Anthropology revived in Semi-Pelagianism, and, speaking by the mouth of Rome, responded: These are extremes of the same faith; both agencies, the human and the divine, are present; are inseparable and co-operative in the beginning, middle, and end of the work; grace is given to all; but it is effectual only by the subject's use of his own remaining freedom to good. And to this, the Latin Anthropology, revived at the Reformation, answers in the Augsburg Confession: "The human will possesses some liberty for the performance of *civil duties*, and the choice of those things lying within the control of reason. But it does not possess the power, without the influence of the Holy Spirit, of being just before God, or of yielding *spiritual obedience*; for the natural man receiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God; but this is accomplished in the heart, when the *Holy Spirit is received through the word*."

For regeneration, the Greek fathers look to divine grace and to the human will; Pelagius, to man alone; Augustine, to God alone. In connection with unconditional election, Augustinian Monergism bids us wait for irresistible grace; with conditional election, it bids us depend on grace, dispensed through divinely appointed means. Predestinarian Augustinianism looks for ability, as the effect of special grace; Lutheran Augustinianism, to regenerating grace, operating through the Word and Sacraments. But, as Lutheranism teaches that grace is equally resistible, and natural depravity equally powerful, in all cases, and yet, that some men do not, and others do, effectually resist, it must admit some kind of agency in the human will. As the difference is not in the grace, or in the depravity, it must be traced to some act of the will, productive or receptive, at some time, during the process, and before its completion. Thus did it seem to stand upon a

precipice, with the alternative of letting go its monergism, or being drawn, by an irresistible logic, into the gulf of unconditional election.

The Confessors seemed to be unconscious of this difficulty; not, I think, because they adopted the Augustinian Predestination; (for though, in their earlier writings, and in the fifth Article of the Confession, they show it some favor; yet, in another, by denying the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, they break a necessary link in the system); but, because—controlled by the practical aspects of the truth—they remanded the work of bringing the great facts of revelation under the influence of the logical movement, into a system, to the schools; and, as matter of Confession and faith, present these facts as they are felt in experience, and received by the intuitions of the reason, rather than through the processes of the understanding. But the difficulty did make itself felt, so soon as the *Calvinistic and Lutheran systems* of doctrine began to be developed. When, in the consequent conflict between the two, the Calvinists deduced, what they regarded as the logical consequences of the Augustinian monergism; Melancthon, and with him a great part of the Lutheran Church, shuddering before the awful gulf of unconditional election, and endeavoring to escape from its brink, accorded "to the human soul, though apostate, an appetency, faint and ineffectual, yet real and inalienable, toward the spiritual and the holy." "Three things concur in the work; the Word of God, the Holy Ghost, and the human will, as non-resisting to the Word of God." Human will and brute will, rational agency and instinctive activity, the good will, or the will as holy, and the will merely as a faculty—the one lost, the other incapable of being lost, without the annihilation of the man himself; the will as a power to think, or desire, or do, what is pleasing to God, and the will as a mode of activity, are to be distinguished. The good will was lost, by the fall, and is only to be restored by divine influence; but the will, as a faculty, remains—as a capacity to accept the offered gifts of grace. This, at one blow, broke the chain of predestinarian consequences, drawn from the Augustinian doctrine of original sin. But it was pronounced synergistic, and was most decidedly condemned and repudiated by the Formula of Concord; the leading author of which, said,

that the sinner had only the same kind of agency in his regeneration that the culprit has in his execution—he must be *there* as the subject of the action. His illustration of the power of man, to come to the new life, is given in the supposed words of a thief, who, on the way to the gallows, should call to the people, running before him to the place of execution: “Not so fast, good people—don’t run ahead of me—if *I am to be hanged, I shall have to be there.*” The Formula of Concord declares, that since the Fall, there is not left in man a spark of spiritual power. The will, by nature, is free only to rebel against God, and is as incapable of all good, as a hard stone, or block, or wild beast; yea, worse than a block, for that cannot resist. Man has only a passive capacity to be regenerated; and regeneration itself, is a literal resurrection from spiritual death. Thus was developed the *Ecclesiastical system*—a step beyond the practical position of the ‘Confession; its authors placing themselves systematically upon Monergistic ground; consciously rejecting the Augustinian predestinarianism; and yet, theoretically and tenaciously, clinging to the Augustinian doctrine of original sin. Even the theory of the Traducian origin of the soul is affirmed. No wonder that Spener denied the binding authority of this Symbol, and felt it necessary to say, that even when it had been received, it was not made binding in all respects.

But how did it relieve itself from the consciousness of the claims of unconditional election and irresistible grace? It relied upon the efficacy of grace, regenerating non-resisting subjects in baptism. All who had been baptized in infancy (and nearly all with whom it dealt were,) belonged to this class. All such,—the work of regeneration, in which God alone operates, being completed—can co-operate. For all such there is the power of synergism. They are no longer merely passive, but can act, in the use of powers, bestowed in regeneration. They are regenerate, though not renewed; children of God, and heirs of salvation, though not converted. For the system distinguished between regeneration and conversion. In regeneration, man is entirely passive; in conversion he is entirely active. In regeneration God bestows powers; in renovation, man uses the powers thus bestowed. Man must be regenerated, before he can be converted. Even the conversion of those, who have fallen after baptism, is

a revival of the life communicated in baptism; for, if it had ever been lost, they could not have been converted. If renewed, and when renewed, after a life of deliberate sin, the conversion of men must be regarded, not as the beginning, *de novo*, of the divine life in the soul; but only an awakening of the spiritual life, bestowed in baptism, and which had never been suspended. "That awakening which occurs when life is restored after sickness, a swoon, or apparent death," says Dr. J. H. Kurtz, one of the great leaders of the modern movement, to revive the Ecclesiastical system, "cannot be mistaken for the bodily birth with which the operations of life commence; as little ought regeneration to be confounded with a spiritual awakening. When that communion with the Lord, which was established in baptism, is not maintained and continually renewed, by means of appropriate spiritual care and sustenance, a spiritual state ensues, which corresponds to bodily sleep, a swoon, or apparent bodily death. * * The recovery of an individual from such a death-like sleep, through the illumination and calling of the Holy Ghost, is termed his awakening." Notwithstanding the absence of all the signs of life and the presence of all the marks of death—the lapse of many years of impenitence, and the commission of multitudes of wilful sins; the awakening must be considered as but the revival of a life, infused in baptism. When the life, infused in baptism, terminates, according to Dr. J. H. Kurtz, "it terminates in actual or eternal death." Once lost, it is never restored. But this same Ecclesiastical system, resisted the doctrine of the "Terminas," or that the day of grace may end before the termination of life, and taught, that it extends to the moment of death; so that the person regenerated in baptism, though always impenitent, never forfeits the claims, or loses the powers bestowed in regeneration, while life lasts; is always in a state of justification, though impenitent, and may, at any moment, up to the brink of eternity, repent and make good his title to eternal life.

The Symbolists, (for this is a proper designation, as the supporters of this system laid exclusive claim to the merit of attachment to, and consistency with, the Symbols—I shall say, therefore, for brevity's sake) the Symbolists made this theory the ground of their practice, in dealing with their hearers. On this ground they called upon them to live to the glory of God, and to use the

powers bestowed on them, in regeneration, at their baptism, for their spiritual renewal; and included, in this number of the regenerate; the most gross and habitual sinners. Thus Newmeister—one of the twenty-seven, out of the thirty ministers of Hamburg, who were champions of Symbolism, against Spener, in his Sermons on "the New Man," addressed to the people for the express purpose of guarding them against that departure from orthodoxy, with which he charges the Pietists, and with manifest desire to be very careful in his statements—says: "The new (regenerated) man is called spirit, both because the Spirit of God dwells in him, and, also, because he has obtained, from him, spiritual powers; so that, he can believe, and live, in a manner well-pleasing to God, and suitable to his eternal salvation. A regenerated believer, co-operates, in the work of renewal—co-operates in that holiness and righteousness, which he is to let shine before men; there is, consequently, a great difference between renewal and regeneration, together with justification. As in justification, so in regeneration, man does nothing at all; this is wholly God's work alone. But as man receives powers in regeneration, when he applies these powers in his renewal, he co-operates, though in much weakness and imperfection. This is clearly taught in the Symbolical Books, especially in Article III. of the Formula of Concord, according to the sacred Scriptures." And on the next page, in the application of the same sermon, he says: "Ardently do I beseech you, one and all, (for one and all of you, became new creatures in baptism) that ye now examine, how ye have used the powers bestowed upon you." Continuing to address these same persons, whom he has just declared to be new creatures, he describes them as persons walking in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banqueting and abominable idolatries." They, according to the symbolistic system, were not renewed; but still they were regenerated, and, consequently, they could act. Though a strenuous monergist, and zealous in warning against the idea that an unregenerated man can be anything else than passive, these drunken, and lascivious, and idolatrous men, he could properly urge to action, because they were regenerated men, the work, in which God is the only efficient, was completed, and now in their renewal, they could co-operate. Consistently, therefore, does he exhort them not

to seek Christ for justification, or the Holy Ghost for regeneration; but that they, as justified and regenerated men, should "no longer live, the rest of their time, in the lusts of the flesh, but to the will of God." And this doctrine, he tells us, contrasts favorably with Calvinism, which makes baptism only an empty sign, and distinguishes it, from regeneration, just as if the latter were not wrought through the former, and as if a man were not really made a new creature in baptism, unless he had, by an absolute decree of God, been predestined to salvation."

Thus were the Lutheran and Calvinistic systems rivals, for the honor of consistent monergism, and of having the best method of meeting the difficulties of the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, for the comfort of saints and the conversion of sinners. And thus did Symbolistic Lutheranism apparently relieve itself from the paralysis of the doctrine of man's perfect passiveness in his regeneration. But it was a delusion, leading only to false activity and groundless hopes. The Pietists said, it was a covert Pelagianism. It had certainly even more power to flatter and deceive itself with delusive hopes. For it had an outward and divine pledge, for all who trusted in it; while Pelagianism had only an inward and human ground, of power to hope for a future and a death-bed conversion. Spener deplored the effects of it, as little better than those of the papal *opus operatum*. And it was a departure from *original and true Lutheranism*. For Symbolism connects justification, with a regeneration, in which there are implanted only the powers for renewal: Luther makes it inseparable from a radical, inner change. Symbolism connects regeneration with the mere implantation of the powers to believe; Luther makes it inseparable from a living faith—a faith which, while it does not justify, because of the love with which it works, is notwithstanding a loving embrace of Christ. Symbolism said, faith, in regeneration, is present only potentially; Luther and the Confessors, that it is present in reality and in action; and this they held to be the case, even in the regeneration of children, in baptism. Symbolism places regeneration before mortification; Melancthon, in the Apology, puts mortification in the sense of contrition; before vivification, in the sense of consolation. Symbolism disconnects the idea of Justification from our sense of forgiveness; Melancthon, in the Apology, connects it with the subjective application

of forgiveness, or the refreshing and enlivening of the heart and conscience. According to Symbolism, the putting off of the old man, is distinct from regeneration, is subsequent to it; but, according to Luther, while the real victory over sin, and the principal expulsion of it, does not precede the beginning of faith in regeneration; yet that faith which accepts the terms of salvation, and brings Christ into the heart, is possible to those only, whose hearts have before been broken and made contrite by the terms of the law, yea, have tasted condemnation and death, in this experience. So Melancthon, in the Apology, does not limit the term regeneration to that part of the great spiritual change, which, in the Symbolistic system is made to monopolize it; but extends it to the conversion and quickening, which occur afterwards, in the course of repentance.

The Ecclesiastical system was intended to afford a reason for that activity, in the work of personal religion, which all feel, that conscience and the Bible require. As we cannot adopt this, let us ask what it was that, with their views of the relative guilt and utter impotency of man, enabled the Confessors to be so intensely active themselves, and to preach so confidently to others, "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." It was, first, the practical state of religion, in which they were. The revival, in which the Reformation was born led them, in its early years, to deal mainly with the practical aspects of truth, to depreciate scholasticism, and to keep in check that process of the understanding which can never be satisfied without a logical form, for all truth, and which, too, attempts to bring, within grasp of logical statement, truths too high for its reach, and too spiritual for the cold clutches of its logic. Content with the facts, as they lie in consciousness and are revealed in the popular expressions of the Bible, they could receive and teach truths, which, to the mere logical understanding, are irreconcilable, and keep the deepest feeling of impotency in perfect harmony with the most intense activity. Truths, liquid in the fervor of religious feelings, flow into each, while separated and put into the cold forms of logic, their inner connection, the bond of their real union, the point at which they are in harmony, is unseen. Every Christian's history, and every revival of religion, affords instances of the power of experience to reconcile apparently

conflicting truths in religion ; of the power of a practical interest in religion to cause a man to realize, that God alone can change his heart ; and, yet to lead him to labor as if the whole work depended upon himself. The doctrine of this article, therefore, will be appropriated by men very much according to the state of religion, and will always be accepted in a revived Christianity. The second reason was, the presence of a true Christian mysticism—that mysticism which, in all its speculative activity, relies more upon the insight of reason, and the intuition of facts, than upon the logical understanding, and the connections of abstract reasoning. Luther had the dialectics of Augustine imbued with the mysticism of the New Testament. Spener says : "That, as he found much more, that was powerful and striving to the heart, in the mystical than in the Scholastic theology, Luther was indebted, and acknowledged his indebtedness to Tauler, and the like mystical writers, more than to any other teachers ; yea, those who are not entirely inexperienced in these things, and who will read especially Luther's earlier writings, in which *God laid the principal power of the Reformation*, will see, that he speaks so often, in the style of the mystics, has so absorbed them, in his own person, and changed them into his own spiritual life and power, that he often quotes from them when he does not, at all, think of it." This tendency always checks that scientific spirit, falsely so-called, which must always have in Religion, as in Nature, a system—a form—a creed, and which, incapable of appreciating the Biblical method of, at once, exhibiting truth to all the capacities of man, is in danger of attempting to bring the boundless domain of the scheme of redemption within its own narrow limits, and of becoming impatient and tyrannical, in its requirement of unity and system in truths, whose real connections can only be realized through experience, and whose inner relations can be comprehended only by a theology which begins its superstructure only upon the facts in Christian consciousness, and attempts to build only as it can work, in the light of revelation and experience.

So when the Ecclesiastical system had culminated in an orthodoxy, which had dispensed with an earnest insisting upon an actual inner change ; yea, regarded zeal for it with the suspicion of heresy ; and denounced as unfaithful to Lutheranism, those who could not believe that re-

generation can exist without a real spiritual renewal; Arndt, influenced by the same Christian mysticism, which operated so powerfully in Luther, felt called to teach anew, what he called "the principal and inmost part of theology"—an experimental change of heart. Thus, would he lead baptized Christians to an actual regeneration. For though he acknowledges, that even the most rebellious sinners, who had been baptized in infancy, were ingrafted into Christ; yet he takes care to say also, that, "as they have not grown in him, through a new life, it is manifest, that they are broken off again, and are cut off like dry branches."

In like manner, Spener seeing that the Ecclesiastical system preached justification without exhibiting the power of a justifying faith, felt himself called to the work of insisting upon that spiritual illumination—that living faith, which utterly changes the character of man. In doing this, he said so much about an active faith—*fidem operosam*—as Arndt had called it, that he was charged, by Symbolists, on every hand, with Synergism, yea, with Pelagianism. But he cared not for this, but insisted, that love contributed to faith—was an element of saving faith—though not a justifying element, and, as love is a most intensely active element, he seemed to teach a Synergism; and yet he evidently held the Monergism of this Article of the Confession; and equally evident is it, that the effect of his method, was to save it from the destructive influence of that which laid exclusive claim to consistency with it. Hagenbach, says that the Pietists kept alive, "the conviction of sin and moral impotency;" when the definitions of the schools had rendered it a dead letter. While Spener regarded the conversion of Christians who had fallen into spiritual death, as a return to Baptismal grace, yet he calls such conversion explicitly and emphatically a new regeneration; inasmuch as the Baptismal regeneration had been entirely lost; and regarding this as the condition of the vast majority of those baptized in infancy, he treated all, who did not exhibit the evidences of spiritual life, as not only unconverted; but unregenerate. He explicitly states and argues this point; showing the absurdity of the presence of life, in the midst of nothing but the marks of death. It was the revival of the early Lutheran method. "In the case of Spener, as in the case of Luther," says Hagenbach. "it was experience

which led him to the knowledge of sin, and moulded his views concerning its nature. Thus it happened, that in his system, sin and penance are closely connected with each other. He does not wait till his views of sin become cold and indifferent; but he strikes, as it were, the iron made red-hot in the furnace of inward experience, while it yet retains all its heat." As Luther returned to primitive Christianity; so did Spener return to early Lutherism. I consider him as not only the second great Reformer of the Church, but also the father of the American Lutheran theology; and, hence, I have dwelt upon the true method of appropriating the Article, which found its full enunciation in his works.

The method of Spener, based upon the maxim: "That personal experience must precede all true knowledge of the truths of Revelation; that the doctrines of the Bible must be felt in order to be rightly apprehended, by the understanding;" has, by the process of Psychological discoveries been proved to be, as correct philosophically, as it is practically important, that it is, indeed, the only true ground of theological science. So also, his method of Ecclesiastical union and discipline—based upon the idea that the whole of revealed truth can never be embraced, in the logical formulas of men, and that, consequently, we must make no human creed the measure of our faith or profession; that we should go first to the Bible, then to the creed; try the creed by the truths, first drawn from the Bible, and not the Biblical system by the Ecclesiastical dogma; subscribe the creed, not *per quia*, but *per quatenus*—this method has, in the course of Ecclesiastical history, been approved by the voice of Providence, as the only true method of preserving the unity of the Church, against the divergent forces, and the fundamental truths of Christianity, against the sceptical tendencies of human nature. And paradoxical as it seemed then, and seems to many now, it has not chilled church feeling, nor checked scientific activity among Christians: but, while it has supplanted the old Ecclesiastical system, and introduced a new method into the entire course of theological study, it has, at the same time, excited a more intense longing for the speculative apprehension of the scriptural idea of the Church, and a more persevering effort for true science, in theology.

And the general result is, that in the course of the study, since that day, of the contents of this Article, the facts of sin and responsibility, of moral impotency and freedom of will, of organic necessity and personal liberty, generic condition and individual activity, are no longer in unconsciousness, as in the early age of the Church; nor in antagonism, as in the intervening period. The two sides of the nature and condition of the individual—as, in his rational nature and spiritual relations, free, and yet in bondage, from his birth to sin and guilt, by his sensuous condition and his unavoidable relations to the race—the generic sinfulness, and the free activity; race, determination, and individual influence, are gradually being recognized, more and more, as only the two sides of one and the same condition and activity. As idealism and sensationalism, long irreconcilable positions in Psychology, were first both accepted as facts, after men began to heed the voice of experience, and are now being, more and more, demonstrated by science to be both true, and in harmony with each other, and as but the two sides of the same subject; so, after men had suspended the scientific operation of connection sufficiently to consult, according to Spener's method, the dictates of experience in Christian consciousness—had sufficiently freed themselves from the tyranny of the theological dogma, and the inflexible constraint of the creed, to be able to listen to the plain declarations of the Bible, then the facts, that we are sinful from our earliest being, and yet responsible; in bondage by our relations to the race, and yet in possession of personal liberty; enslaved by sin, and yet capable of activity, in view of motives presented by the gospel, and urged by conscience—began to be found both true, and neither, exclusive of the other. The great facts of inborn depravity and personal responsibility, of native impotence and possible activity, in view of the offers, and under the influence, of divine grace, are, more and more, felt to be in perfect harmony. And the theological mind of Christendom is beginning, with some success, to put into *systematic* connection, what has long ago been *felt* to be in harmony. It is not, indeed, a connection of the logical understanding, but rather an intuition of the reality of a harmonious connection, between the offer of mercy, on the one hand, and the capacity to receive, on the other; between the

command to repent, and the power to obey, produced, partly by the force of the command itself, in deepening, through the experience involved, the sense of the need of divine help; and partly by the superadded influence of the Holy Spirit—the philosophy of the adage of Augustine: *Ille facit, ut faciamus*.

Finally, it has learned that, though our liberty is limited—limited by God, limited by organic nature, limited by original sin, limited by acquired character; yet it is real—that holiness, in the sense in which the Bible presents and conscience requires it, is unattainable by the unaided powers of man; that, if men are saved at all, they must be saved by grace, through faith, and that a faith which they cannot produce, but can only receive; that in regeneration, they do not bring themselves to God, but only yield to God's drawing; and yet that this act, though not productive, but only receptive, is still an act, and though a yielding act, it is still a real act; and that though God is the only efficient agent, man is not entirely passive or inactive, in his repentance. Thus is the work still a monergism, and the fundamental truth of the Article remains, teaching us that God produces all in the change, and that we act it all; admonishing us to work out our own salvation with fear and with trembling; since it is God himself who, of his own good pleasure, worketh in us, both to will and to do, and commanding us, confidently, to use all the means of grace, but to be satisfied with no idea of a justification and a regeneration, as saving us from the sin which "still condemns and causes eternal death," which is not connected with scriptural evidence of an actual inner change from sin to holiness, from spiritual death to spiritual life.

ARTICLE IX.

THE PREACHING BEFORE THE REFORMATION. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. COSACK, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN KONIGSBERG.

By Rev. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Ind.

I propose to exhibit the state of preaching which the Reformation of the sixteenth century found in the Church. This is a difficult task, for the materials lie scattered over a large territory, which must be collected and arranged in a small frame, so as to afford a picture having symmetry and unity; and it is also difficult, because we must keep on the narrow path of justice between preconceived Protestant prejudices and the bold claims of modern Catholicism.

Rome, *i. e.*, her clergy, is found, at present, in a defensive position, in which she can maintain herself only for a short time, and that with difficulty; yet the Romish Church, and Roman theology, and learning in general, is now in a state of restoration. They are, more than ever, anxious to ignore the Reformation of the sixteenth century, especially that in Germany, and represent the condition of things, immediately before the Reformation, in much brighter colors, a period which we all acknowledge as one of the saddest in the history of the Church. We have been accustomed to speak of a few of the more enlightened men of the fifteenth century as the "Reformers before the Reformation." We prided ourselves in John Wessel, of whom Luther says: "If I had read Wessel sooner, my adversaries would have said — 'Luther has taken everything from Wessel,' so closely do our spirits resemble each other." We did not expect any opposition when we rejoiced over him as a forerunner of Luther, but in Munich he has lately been reclaimed for the Romish Church. It was natural with us to honor Luther as the originator of German hymnology, but a Professor of German literature, at Vienna, makes this assertion: "The thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries must be looked upon

as the blossoming period of German hymnology;" and again: "It is a most extraordinary phenomenon, that Protestantism, from Luther down to Paul Gerhard, cannot boast of a single sacred poet of any eminence." We were accustomed to attribute to Luther great inventive merit as the translator of the German Bible, although we knew that there were extant several translations older than the master-piece that emanated from the Wartburg, now it is pretended that the famous words of Sebastian, in his "Fool's Ship"—"*all Land synt voll heilge gschrift*," (all countries are full of holy scriptures) prove that the Bible was in general use among the Germans, at the close of the fifteenth century, which would make of Luther's great work a sort of *Ilias post Homerum*.

The Pulpit had its epoch in the Reformation, and especially in Luther's own example. We look upon the Reformation as having restored and resurrected the preaching that was neglected and almost died out. It is natural enough for modern Catholics, in their restorative struggle, to attack this generally received opinion as an entire delusion. A Catholic organ, the *Tubingen Quarterly*, has proposed to itself the task of dispelling that delusion. And it is from this quarter that I have been induced to examine into the real state of things, with reference to preaching, as the Reformation found it.

According to the representations of many of the older and later writers, both Protestant and Catholic, it may seem questionable whether there was preaching, to any extent worth mentioning, in the period preceding the Reformation. Many would answer this in the negative. A theologian of Göttingen, whose history of the Church was long considered good authority, represents Church services as having been degraded into the ceremony of the Mass, and he assures us, that preaching became more and more rare at the close of the Middle Ages. A later historian, of the school of Leo, as to whom Catholics give the testimony that he is free from confessional prejudice, asserts: "The pulpit was of course silent before Luther's appearance." Even a Catholic of Westphalia, is just now elaborating a very dark picture of this period. He says: "Church *cultus* degraded, Church neglected, preaching still less respected; where the sermon was still known, there it was made up of pointless fables and legends, the

people were not preached to, and the churches visited but little."

We wish to confine ourselves to the condition of the pulpit in that period; that preaching should have been of such rare occurrence, cannot be maintained, for there are proofs to the contrary. There are extant collections of sermons of the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, some of which have been repeatedly issued. A few of them may here be mentioned. Of Germans we have a *hortulus reginae*, garden of heaven's queen, a collection of one hundred and twenty Sermons by Meffrath; we must name John Herold, a Dominican of Basel, who wrote under the modest name of *Pupil*, the Augustinian Gottschalk Hollen, of Osnabrück; Paul Wann and Michael Lochmayer, Canonici of Passau; the learned Gabriel Biel, of Tübingen, generally regarded as the last of the scholastics, of whom there is a volume of Lent Sermons, under the title of "*Fasciculus myrrhæ*;" and those already belonging to the sixteenth century, Dr. Gregor Morgenstern, of Leipzig, Joseph Meder, a Franciscan, of Basel, and especially the "*Tuba vocalissima*," of the Strasburg Church, John Geiler, of Kaisersberg, whose celebrated sermons on the "Fool's Ship" of Sebast. Brant, are generally familiar. Of the French, we refer to Pepin, the Dominican; Nicolas de Nyse, of Rouen, whose sermons bear the title, "*Gemma prædicantium*;" Oliver Mailard, the Franciscan, court preacher at Paris, and also filling the pulpits of Toulouse, Nantes and Bruegge; the Rector of the College of Navarra, in Paris, Jean Raulin, who has left a collection of sermons under the title "*Itinerarium paradisi*;" Michael Minot, a Franciscan, whose satirical pulpit discourses made the people of Paris, Tours and Northern France, laugh, even to the days of King Frank I.

In England, there were Stephan Baron, and the venerable Bishop of Rochester, John Fisher, who paid for his opposition to the ecclesiastical supremacy of King Henry VIII., with his head, on Tower Hill. Of Hungarians, we mention Oswald Pelbart, who, among others, has arranged a series of sermons as a star-crown, "*Stellarium Beatæ Virginis*."

Finally, of the Italians, there are Bernhardin of Busti, the spirited defender of the "*Immaculata conceptio Mariæ*;" the Minorite Robert Caraccioli, or, with his more familiar

name, Robert de Licio, who, according to Erasmus, moved his hearers to tears whenever he wished, and even effected this with one who had wagered for a *lauta cœna*, that with him it should not succeed. I name yet the great Dominican, the prophetic, strict Girolamo Savonarola, and his talented, but otherwise unequal, brother of the order, Gabriel Barleta, of whom the saying came: "*Qui nescit barletare, nescit prædicare.*"

Of all these, and of how many more, there are printed sermons extant, mostly quite extensive, and all from the years 1480 — 1520. Besides these, the public and private libraries contain many sermons in manuscript, especially of the Mystics, who, perhaps, had good reason to avoid the printing press. Indeed, if we look over the vast materials, we cannot avoid the impression, that the book market was flooded with sermons, immediately before the Reformation, no less than it now is. Wimpfeling, of Schlettstadt, makes the remark, that the German book sellers have nothing *proper* (*nil elegantis*) on the shelves, only certain sermon books, with which they impose on the country preachers, (*quibus sacerdotes rurales fallunt*). This complaint shows that preaching was in vogue in the country, as well as in the cities. There are yet other proofs to this effect. In the rising of the peasants, the clamorous rebels do not complain of the scarcity of preaching, in their *gravamina*, but they cry: "*Da, da ist das recht Evangeli; lueg, lueg, wir hand die alten Pfaffen gelogen und falsch gepredigt, man soll die Buben alltodd schlagen, wie hand sie uns all so herrlich betrogen und genarrt.*" Indeed, proofs might be adduced that, notwithstanding the very prevalent opinion, that there was very little preaching, they complained of too much preaching. The celebrated Chancellor of the University of Paris, John Gerson, who was himself a very noted preacher, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, says: "There is too much preaching, because the Mendicants send every one in the pulpit who can speak a few words without offence." And, at the close of that century, Geiler, of Strasburg, who preached a whole life-time, and often three times a day, allows the prelates, whom he had admonished of their duty, to offer the excuse: "The quantity of sermons is so large that it has created a disgust with the masses;" he acknowledges the fact, and adds: "Yes, *multi e numero, sed perfectionis laude rarissimi.*"

But with all this, we do not mean to say that even the amount of preaching was all that could be desired. There are to be found, in the writings of that period, many and loud calls upon the clergy not to neglect so important and necessary a duty as preaching. A widely circulated manual for the clergy, called "Conscience-bath of priests," (*lavaerum conscientie sacerdotum*), blames, with very commendable force, those ministers who have neither the ability nor the inclination to preach. The most reliable witnesses, among others Wimpfeling, testify unanimously, that many of the foremost of the clergy considered it a disgrace to preach, and mocked their more faithful brethren as *doctores beguinarum*, (teachers of praying sisters). He makes honorable mention of a few exceptions, to the number of four or five among the bishops, who preached at all: Leonhard, of Eglaffstein; Matthew, the Bishop of Sitten; George of Anhalt, a prince in the pulpit, and of Bishop Adolph, of Merseburg, it is said, that he entered the pulpit on the principal festivals. In England, the Bishops Fisher, of Rochester, and West, of Ely, are rare cases, as those who preached at all. And Erasmus says that the Bishop of London read his sermons, because of extreme old age, and adds: "*Id quod multi frigidi faciunt in Anglica.*" These three examples belong, perhaps, already to the period of the Reformation. In an obituary of 1499, the remark is made of the Monk Bernhard, that he was so learned as to have preached for several years. The assumption is, perhaps, gratuitous, that every congregation had its own pastor, who was able to give the most necessary instructions on the Ten Commandments, the sin unto death, and the Articles of Faith; that he knew the formula of the sacraments, could explain the festivals and the statutes of the Synods, and read the Mass. Descending to this minimum of the requirements, is a proof of the ignorance and moral unfitness of the clergy. Gerson, who makes the above requirements, esteems the office very highly; he says: "Did Pythagoras consider no one qualified as the political leader of a people, who had not acquired an entire self-control? so important a matter as preaching, ought to be entrusted only to the calmest and wisest natures." And the title of his sermons—*Sermones quadragesimales* and *Sermones de sanctis*, being sermons for Lent and Advent—shows that, whilst preaching was not unknown, it was anyhow not very general. Even

now, the Holy days, Lent and Advent, are the chief preaching seasons in the Catholic Church. Whilst we scarcely recognize any divine services that have no preaching connected therewith, the Catholic Church does not consider the sermon an integral part of divine worship. And what Prince George of Anhalt says, harmonizes well with this fact: "In Italy they preach during Advent and Lent, but in Germany also on the Sundays and Festivals, sometimes, indeed, fables and dreams in place of the Word of God." Taking it all in all, this much may be asserted with safety—they recognized the necessity and value of preaching, more and more, toward the beginning of the Reformation. Wherever they loved the Church, there they encouraged preaching; preaching was never entirely neglected, but practiced regularly in many places, both in the city and in the country. This is more general at the close than at the beginning of the fifteenth century, sustained by those friends of Reform, found in the bosom of the Church.

Another remark to be made in this connection is this, that, as a rule, they preached, not in Latin, but in the language of the people. This should not have been disputed. The opinion, however, is very general, that in the Middle Ages, and especially in the century before the Reformation, all the preaching that was done, was in the Latin language. This is really a monstrous idea. But it is true what a good Protestant of Hamburg says: "There is scarcely a period of history that is so little known, in many respects, as the century before the Reformation." Fluegge, of Göttingen, declares that the preaching of the fifteenth century, was almost exclusively in Latin; and Delprat, of Holland, thirty years later, advances the same opinion. Several other Historians entertain the same view, and one of them praises Geiler for having labored to do away with the Latin language in the pulpit. Even without having any proofs to the contrary, that, namely, there was preaching in the German, French, Italian and English languages, the fact is made out *a priori*. Absurdity stops at the boundaries of the impossible, although an abundant measure of it may, with justice, be charged to that century. As little as Latin preaching could have converted the Germans to Christianity, or aroused the people of Germany and France to a crusade against the Holy Land,

so little could the Chancellor Gerson, with Latin sermons, have comforted the Parisians under the sad reign of King Charles VI., or his celebrated speech on State matters, which he delivered in presence of the French Court and of the King, have drawn upon him the ill-will of the Duke of Orleans, had it been in Latin. "His eloquence," says one of his admirers, "was in his love to God and to his brethren." But if it was eloquence, it must have been heard, understood and felt. And John de Capistrano, who in so short a time extemporized an army of Crusaders against Belgrade, pacified the Hussite commotions, and with his fiery, popular eloquence, brought old times back again, indeed, did preach in Latin, but he had an interpreter by his side, who rendered it in the language of the people. And who can think of John Huss, arousing the Bohemians in the Bethlehem Church of Prague, as speaking any other language than Bohemian? or Savonarola, exciting the Florentinians, speaking anything but Italian? But whence comes the notion that the preaching was entirely Latin?

The Latin is the exclusive ecclesiastical and *cultus* language of the Romish Church. But this exclusiveness has its boundary, where that ceases which appertains to the sacraments, the Liturgy and the Mass; that which is specially Romish, and has any *opus operatum* conception connected with it. The printed sermons, as also the MSS. are all Latin; that does not prove, however, that they were also preached in Latin, but only that they were written out in that language. However strange it may appear in our day, when we are under no special inducements to make use of that language in our writings, and least of all would compose in Latin what is to be delivered in our own language; in those days this was quite natural. Even in later times the same has occurred. In Hamburg there are preserved, sermons in Latin MS. of the first Lutheran pastor of St. James, and of another one, of the beginning of the seventeenth century. There are extant of Luther, from his earliest efforts toward a Reformation, fifteen hundred and forty-seven Latin sermons, in manuscript. We know of two regular quartos in our own city library, full of Latin manuscripts of sermons of our own Rev. Polander. Even of John Aug. Ernesti, of Leipzig, who died in 1781, it is related that he composed all his sermons in Latin. Those publications were not intended for private

edification. They were really designed for those preachers who could not compose their own sermons, or such as desired to take it easy. Many of these collections indicate this in their title. *Sermones prædicabiles, omni tempore prædicabiles*, also, *parati*, or, *opus cunctis verbi divini proclamatoribus perutile ac necessarium*, are very common titles. The same is done under figurative names: *Dormi sine cure*, is a favorite name for many collections. I am in possession of some, whose title is too naïve to be passed over: "*Sermones dominicales cum expositionibus, evangeliorum per annum, satis notabiles et utiles, omnibus sacerdotibus, pastoribus et capellanis, qui Dormi secure vel Dormi sine cure sunt noncupati eo, quod absque magno studio faciliter possunt incorporari et populo prædicari.*" It is printed in very good type, at Strasburg, in 1487. To publish such things in Latin, was considered a matter of literary dignity. Rather than give offence to him, for whose sleep so much solicitude is expressed, the work of translating was exacted, for it was promised *sine magno studio*, and not without the "*magno.*" It need not be supposed that such translating was entirely free from labor, with many of the preachers. For such, however, there were special vocabularies; one, well known and extensively used, is the *vocabularius prædicantium* of Magister John Melber, of Geroltzhofen, selected from the sermons of Dr. John Eichmin, of Calov. He designates his book as a "*prædicatoribus consolabile enavigium.*" The Latin words are given in alphabetic order, and opposite them, several definitions in German. But Geiler, of Kaisersberg, complains, in spite of Melber, that one had rendered the passage in the Psalm: *Eripiet me de laqueo venantium*—"he will snatch me from the poisoning ropes." He says, he knows many such Latinists, who slur over the passages of Scripture and those from the Fathers, like geese, but as soon as it comes to rendering them in German, one can observe how much they know. Another one, John Ulrich Surgant, a Doctor both of theology and law, who was ever ready to assist the preachers of his times, gives us, in his most excellent book, published in the year 1506, and entitled "*Manuale Curatorum,*" some directions for translating—"regulas vulgarizandi." He says: "If the preacher has composed his sermon in Latin, (*inventione, dispositione, elucutiones habitis,*) he must, in order to make the people understand it, and that it may profit them, translate it in the

common language. He need not translate literally, "*but de sensu ad sensum; grossæ et turpes vulgarizationes*" are to be avoided; a word cannot always be rendered by its synonym in the opposite language, and even the conscientious preacher need not hesitate to be a little more verbose in the German translation, for the *rutidas audientium* requires that."

We refer yet to one particular in reference to the language, for which the sermons from the last days of the Middle Ages are remarkable; especially those of the Frenchmen Menot and Maillard, and Barleta, the Italian, of whom there is a large number of sermons extant, in the strangest mixture of Latin and French, and Latin and Italian. Those who—because the printed sermons of that period are in Latin—believed, that that was the universal language of the pulpit before the Reformation, really think that these mixed sermons were preached in this Macarony Latin. As if *e. g.*, Menot had really preached concerning Magdalene, whom he, as was customary at that time, identified with Mary, Martha's sister, in this manner: "*Primum ergo quid fuit causa hujus mulieris perditionis? Fuit elegantia corporis. Videbatur, *QU'ELLE FUT FAITE POUR REGARDER. Pulchra, juvenis, alta, VERMEILLE, PLEINE, VERMEILLE COMME UNE ROSE, MIGNONNE, FRINGANTE. Credo, quod non erat nisi quindecim vel sedecim annorum, quando INCEPIT sic vivere, et triginta, quando rediit ad bonitatem Dei. Martha soror non audebat ei dicere verbum, et videbatur ei quod faciebat magnum honorem illis, qui veniebant ad illam; quidquid faciebat, erat vivere A SON PLAISIR, FAIRE DES BANQUETS, hodie, invitare, etc. UN PEU APRES CETTE PAUVRE SOTTE ABANDONNEE erat in castro suo. LE BRUIT CONRAIT DEJA PAR TOUTE LA JUDIE ET LE PAYS DE GALILEE. Omnes bibendo et comedendo loquebantur de ea et de ejus vita, etc.*" If these men had really preached in this way, we might well become indignant over it, with an historian of the last century, who calls such mixing of the languages, "a stain on human reason." These lively preachers rendered certain passages of their Latin composition, at once, in the language in which they expected to preach, to make them prominent in their memory. The like has been found to be the case with others, even such as have no vein of burlesque running

* The words in SMALL CAPITALS are French.

through their discourse. In the written sermons of Thomas de Villanova, who was Archbishop of Valentia and Confessor of Charles V., who was beatified by Pope Paul V., and canonized by Alexander VII., honors which, in whatever light we may regard them, at any rate indicate his high standing, we find the same mixture of Latin and Spanish. And of Barleta, I possess several editions, where there is a similar mixing of the Latin with Italian. In all these references there are many proofs that they did preach, and preached in the language of the people. Evidences to this effect, could be greatly multiplied, if that were desirable; and it can be shown, that it is really doubtful whether there was any preaching, of a general character, in the Latin language at all. Before audiences who were familiar with the Latin, as in the monasteries, it was undoubtedly the case, and even then, it was often otherwise, for the monks did not all understand the Latin. Geiler, of Strasburg, preached the funeral sermon of Bishop Albert, in Latin, in the year 1506; he was loth to do it, but was urged to, against his will; he says that it was difficult for him to speak in Latin, for he had a whole life-time preached in German to the people. Here and there, Latin preaching remained in vogue, as a relic of older times; but it may be doubted whether the people collected to hear such a discourse, unless they got to hear it in connection with the mass, at which a number of clergymen were generally present. For such occasions there was a regulation, that at least the Lord's prayer and the Creed should be read in German. It is worthy of remark that Luther, in his Formula Missæ, of 1523, refers twice to the German sermon, without any special occasion, where he gives a presentation of an evangelical service; once when he speaks of the poor selection in the *pericopes* of the Gospels and Epistles: "*Interim supplebit hoc vernacula concio*," and a second time, when he speaks of the place for the sermon, whether it should come before the *introitus* of the Mass, or after the Creed.

But enough; this much is certain, that, so far as there was any preaching, in the period of which we speak, it was principally in the language of the people, and only as an exception, in Latin.

But in what spirit did they preach? This is yet the most important point. This has already been referred to in our discussion of the preaching of that day, and the

language it was in. Allow me a few strokes, to mark upon this picture the contents, the value or worthlessness, of the preaching before the Reformation. I shall pass over the extreme want of taste, the superstitious and senseless legends, that were rehearsed by preachers of the common orders, without regard to decency or profit; and those foolish caricatures, which the begging monks indulged in, to the great entertainment of the vulgar, and which the worldly-minded clergymen imitated for the sake of popularity. Erasmus confirms, as true in his day, what Laurentius Valla, the Humanist, affirms of the middle of the century: "It has come to this, that preaching is degraded to making a noise, and consists in the ability to halloo; the speaking is more of a roaring, and the best screamer is the best preacher." I may, also, pass over the foolishness of learning which spread itself in the sermons, by endless quotations, not from the Church-fathers only, but also from the scholastics and profane writers, from Aristotle and Seneca, and even Terence, the erotic writings of Ovid, and from the books of canonical and civil law. It is often enough a very cheap show of learning which displays itself in the pulpit, since there are helps of all sorts, alphabetically arranged proof passages from the fathers, the so-called *Autoritates Aristotelis, Senecæ, &c.*, topical anecdotes from biography and history. That same preacher who pretends that he understands Aristotle as a school boy understands his reader, manifests that he knows nothing of the Greek, although he refers to Greek etymologies. We will glance hurriedly at the most distinguished preachers. Those "stains on human reason," Barleta, Maillard and Menot, appear to me very spirited, popular speakers; they are good in denunciation; they fearlessly attack and lash all orders of society, but they seem to feel themselves secure behind the generality of their reproofs; they twine all the phenomena of both public and private life, most beautifully in their sermons, which gives them an importance in the history of the culture, that characterized the end of the Middle Ages. Barleta frequently touches on politics; he loves Italy, mourns over her divided and unhappy condition, in eloquent words, and makes frequent use of Dante, Petrarch, and other cotemporary poets; but like all the others, he has a jumble of scholasticisms in all his sermons. In Germany we refer to Geiler, of Strasburg, who was undoubtedly the most distin-

guished preacher of this whole period. Upon the whole, he comes up to his own requirement, that, namely, a preacher must preach simple, common, useful and instructive things; disputations and other high things, he must attend to, at home and in the schools; but he did not leave philosophy, and what was then called astronomy, entirely out of his sermons, he is at times very scholastic, dry and empty. In general, however, he has pointed wit and good humor at his command, although it sometimes manifests itself in a tedious play upon words. Much knowledge of human nature, a rich experience of life, and an honest horror against everything that is bad, which he understands so well to impress upon his hearers, are apparent in all his sermons. But much further he does not go. He denounces vice, recommends virtue, praises the saints, and condemns sinners; but redemption, the finished redemption of a fallen world, the peace of soul that follows on justification through the grace of God in Christ Jesus, a holy life, as the fruit of a new heart, are not preached. And yet, the excellent Strasburger is dry wood in a dry pile of brush.

At the close of the fifteenth, and in the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, there are traces of a theory of preaching. Of Stephen Hoest, a Professor of Heidelberg, we have a *modus prædicandi subtilis*, with which, however, I am not acquainted. But there is a greater name, John Reuchlin. In 1502, the pestilence drove him to Denkendorf, in Wurtemberg, into a monastery of the Dominicans. For his hospitable reception, he manifested his gratitude by giving lectures on the art of preaching, and, on their urgent request, gave them a *resumé* of these lectures in a "*Liber de arte prædicandi*." It is poor, unimportant, and scarcely worthy of the name Reuchlin. These elementary definitions of rhetoric, are worthy of notice, not on account of their intrinsic merit, but as the symptoms of the stand-point of young theologians, and even older priests, for it is designed for both. It is difficult to realize how Reuchlin can entertain the hope, which he expresses at the close of the dedication toward the provost of the monastery: *Accipe hoc munusculum grato animo, quod, quamquam parvum exstat corpore, tamen mea sententia lucebit plurimum virtutibus.*

The *Manuale Curatorum*, by Surgant, of Basel, from the year 1506, is much more thorough upon this subject,

and furnishes many an excellent hint, with regard to the times, and the condition of the Church and the Pulpit. It breathes the hopeful air of a Reformation. But the four-fold meaning of Scripture, is zealously maintained, and the whole ballast of the scholastics is preserved like a precious jewel. It is a sad little library, to which this well-meaning man points his candidates for the ministry. But this book, if we compare it with the "Ecclesiast" of Erasmus, appearing fifty years later, shows plainly that, in this interval, a new spirit from on high had been breathed into the dead Church, although Erasmus did not venture to take that decisive step toward a Reformation. I have not proposed to myself the task of picturing and praising Luther, as a preacher. To speak of Luther truly is to praise him. This much is true, that in the bright light of his greatness in the pulpit, the dark condition of the fifteenth century becomes visible. What Luther does *not* preach, shows us the nothingness of that which Meffrath, Gabriel Biel, and Bernhardin de Busti have spoken; what he *did* preach enables us to realize what was lacking in Gerson and Geiler. If it could be said of Gerson, that his eloquence consisted in his love to God; of Luther I would say, his eloquence is the power of the love of God, the grace of Christ which he believes in, simple as a child, and unshaken as a hero.

ARTICLE X.

THE ADVENT OF CHRIST. BY REV. F. AHLFELD, OF LEIPSIG. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.*

By Rev. J. B. RATH, A. M., Bethlehem, Pa.

To-day, my beloved, we enter upon the new Church-Year. May the Lord's blessing attend us throughout its whole course! But what is meant by the new Church-Year? Alas! my dear hearers, the Church has forgotten its signification to such a degree, that she scarcely knows

*Sermon by a very popular Minister of the Gospel, preached on the first Sunday in Advent, and based on Matt. 21 : 1—9.

what her own year is. The question may be asked: what has the year to do with the Church, or the Church with the year?

The natural year, you know, is determined by the sun. One revolution of the earth around this luminary, constitutes a year. In such a year we have four seasons:—the lovely Spring, the warm Summer, the fruitful Autumn, and the severe, quiet Winter. Each of these seasons has its own definite features. In the firmament of the Christian Church, there also stands a sun—that sun is Jesus Christ, which shines by day and by night, forever and ever. And, as the earth revolves around the natural sun, so, in like manner, the Church takes her annual course around the gracious Sun of Righteousness, and contemplates the successive scenes and teachings in the sacred history of the Redeemer. Her Spring-time is the lovely season of Christmas and Epiphany, in which Christ becomes man, and in which he is declared to be the glorious Son of God, with power. Her scorching Summer, is the season of Christ's fasting and suffering, when the expectation of his death oppresses her like a close and sultry atmosphere, and in which the death-storm, which had long been gathering, finally breaks in, and the dreadful bolt bursts from the black cloud of sin, and smites the JUST ONE. Her Autumn—her harvest-time; these are the days in which the Holy Ghost is poured out upon the disciples, and in which, during the long series of Trinity Sundays, the fruits of the Spirit are gathered from the fruitful field of the Triune God into the Garner of the heart. To this enriching season belong the most varied portions of the history of Christ. Wherever he stands, whatever he does, whenever he prays,—each of these is a field, in which the believer may reap a rich harvest. Finally, the severe and quiet Winter arrives. With the twentieth day after Trinity commence the Gospels, which treat of the last things. Life's Winter-storm is felt to be upon us, at the bier of the youth at Nain, and at the death-bed of Jairus' daughter. In the house of the king, who made a marriage for his son, but who found one of his guests without a proper wedding-garment, and in the vicinity of that other king who reckoned with his servants, and found one of them a great debtor without repentance and without a new life, we are seized with a feeling as if a

blasting wintry frost had chilled our inward parts. "The plants which the Father has planted," will be gathered into the house, built for them from the beginning of creation, as it is written: "Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Those which he has not planted will be "rooted up," according to the declaration: "I have never known you; depart from me ye workers of iniquity." On the last, or twenty-seventh, Sunday after Trinity, all the different gospel lessons in use treat of the entrance into the kingdom of glory, into life everlasting. Thus on the first day of the Church-Year, we preach Him, "in whom we shall have life, and have it more abundantly." On the last day, the believer attains to that which was the aim and end of all his labor. This Church-Year is a true year; it is more naturally arranged and divided than the civil year. It commences with its vernal harbingers and its season of Spring; it closes with its Winter, with death and judgment, but also with victory over death and judgment. The civil year begins in Winter and also ends in Winter; its course and division are not according to nature.

Beloved Christians, you too desire to make a circuit around the gracious Sun of Righteousness; you, too, desire the warmth and light of its blessed rays! Therefore, I entreat you, give heed, to-day, to the first ray that falls upon the poor, dark and cold heart. "Unto you shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings." This gracious Sun of Righteousness sheds its first vernal beams in the exclamation:

"Behold thy King cometh unto thee meek!"

Thy Lord doth come in spirit meek,
Thy welfare, not his own, to seek;
Be not offended at his state,
Nor let Him for his entrance wait.

- I. Thy Lord doth come in spirit meek,
Thy welfare, not his own, to seek.

It is a singular royal entrance that is described in our gospel-lesson. The Lord, the true King of Israel, proceeds from Jericho to Jerusalem. But "he hath no form or comeliness that we should desire him." The beast upon which he enters, is a borrowed one. He sends two of his followers to Bethphage, on Mount Olivet, who "shall find there an ass tied, and a colt with her; they shall loose

them and bring them unto him." And thus he enters, not upon a proud, royal steed, but, as Zechariah had prophesied: "Tell ye the daughter of Zion, 'Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.'" When other kings publicly enter their capitals or their castles, the roads are usually carpeted with rich cloth and tapestry, over which they ride. Here the poor people spread, in the way, their own garments, which had, indeed, little in common with royal carpets. When any other king enters his capital, his heralds ride before him. These bear his colors and proclaim his name, his fame, and his kingdom. Here the heralds are poor children, who enter with him into the city and the Temple and publish his name. Whoever looks upon this procession with the eye of an earthly king, or whoever compares it with a royal pageant, as frequently occurs, may well smile and say: "Oh, sorry king! your glory is borrowed property, and your royalty is of little account." And yet, he who can understand intimations, he who can trace the deep and hidden features in this picture, must say: "It was a wonderful train." What was it that attracted these multitudes to him? What was it that collected the crowds of children around him? *It was that fulness of divine power concealed in him.* No one can discover the hidden power of the magnet in its external appearance. It looks like an ordinary piece of iron; yet it attracts all the iron that comes within the reach of its influence. And the Lord born of God, also without form and comeliness, draws unto himself whatever is of God. What was it that induced that man to allow the beasts to be taken, upon the authority of the mere words: "The Lord hath need of them." It was the feeling that the Lord is also his Lord, and the Lord of all his property. Without lands, without throne; without sceptre, without crown; without purple, without pomp, and yet a King with all power. And with the exclamation: "Hosanna to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest," it seems as if the heavens would open, and as if the ancient, the eternal glory would descend upon him, as if he gloried in the eternal crown. Do not shut your eyes, lest you belong to those, of whom it is written: "They have eyes, but they see not, they have ears, but they hear not."

But tell me, dear Christian, why did he come in such

lowliness? Why did he forsake his glory and his eternal hosts? For your sake. He wanted to blot out your sins with his blood; he desired to bear your guilt. But whoever bears a load of guilt, be it his own or that of another, does not appear in royal apparel. He, who wears a crown of thorns, wears no crown of glory. He came in such lowliness for your sake. You shall *believe* in him. But had he come in his power and glory, had he come with his heavenly hosts, had he come in such majesty as would crush the world and the hearts of men, like the thunder-bolt shatters the tree, where would there have been occasion for faith? The world would have been prostrated at his feet. Children would not have been born to him as dew-drops at the dawn of day, which silently form on the grass, but in each of which the rising sun forms its image. Servants and slaves, in unnumbered hosts, would have been gained for him. A new *law* would have been delivered, but no *gospel* published. But those that serve Him who "denied himself and took upon himself the form of a servant," those are truly his, they are his from within, and not from without. But that you may know that he is your Lord, that he is God's only begotten Son, that he is the King of all worlds; of this he has given you sufficient intimation in this public entrance also. Let the following parable illustrate this. Once upon a time there was a king who had two kingdoms. He lived in the capital of one of them, and thence ruled the other, without dwelling therein. After some time the king received this message: "Your subjects, in the other kingdom, despise you, mock at your name and treat your commands with contempt. They say: 'We have no king.'" Then the King said to his son: "Arise my son, go and bring the rebellious nation again into subjection to my authority. But be careful to learn who among them is still loyal to me, and who has hardened his heart in rebellion and obstinacy." Then the son dressed himself in mean garments, and took a staff into his hand and departed into the other kingdom—he entirely alone. Now whoever looked upon his mean apparel, and perceived that he came without attendants and army, despised him, and was unwilling to reverence him as the king's son. But whoever looked upon his countenance recognized it, as the countenance of a king, and discovered in it the royal features of his father. And whoever discerned these features and bowed the knee before

him, to him he revealed himself more fully, yea to him he gave letters of pardon from his father. He affixed his father's seal thereto, for he was his son. When he had finished this, he returned home. To the faithful he gave these instructions: "Collect out of the nation all loyal subjects; for after some time I will come again with my father's army and slay the rebels with his sword." No one shall then perish who is, or meanwhile has become, loyal to him. In like manner has our Father in heaven given the kingdom to his Son. He, too, came poor and lowly; he, too, had laid aside the royal apparel of divine glory. But whoever looked into his face recognized the only begotten Son of God. Whoever adhered to him in faith, upon him he bestowed the pardon and blessings of his Father. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." He impresses his Father's seal upon their hearts. But there is a time when he will come again. Then God shall be all in all. Those who have not accepted his mercy must submit to his dread sentence. Whoever will not lay hold of him in faith, will be laid hold of with power. Your King has come to you in meekness, to show you the mild nature of his kingdom. His kingdom is not of this world. The worldly kings domineer, and the mighty are called gracious lords. In his kingdom matters are reversed. Whoever humbleth himself shall be exalted. In this kingdom that is lofty and great, which has become small for Christ's sake, "The meek shall inherit the earth;" those "having nothing shall possess all things." He, who washed the feet of his disciples, who bore the crown of thorns, who himself bore his cross to Calvary, he is the King of Glory; he has been exalted far above the heaven of heavens. And as to the princes associated with this King in his realm—who are they? They are those who, for his name's sake, endure persecutions, who are objects of ridicule to the worldly-wise, who are crowned, day by day, with mockery's thorny crown. But they may not say it to themselves, that they are great on this account. In the moment in which they say it, they forfeit their dominion. The Lord must make mention of it to them—he *will* make mention of it.

- II. Be not offended at his state,
Nor let him for his entrance wait.

Beloved Christians, what is that which hinders us most

from believing in the only begotten Son of God? It is his lowliness, which lies as a stumbling-block in our path; it is this that makes us falter. We say: "He is born of a woman, even as I am; and shall *he* be the Son of Almighty God! He was so poor that "he had not where to lay his head." He enters the city of Jerusalem more like a beggar than a king, and shall *he* be Lord and King of all things! He dies on the cross like a malefactor, and shall he have life in himself, shall *he* be the fountain of all life! Christ crucified was unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks, foolishness; and there is, probably, not a soul among us, whose faith has not, at some time or other, been shaken by Christ's lowliness. But what is the cause of such faltering? It is our own pride, it is our own perverted idea of that, which is accounted great before God. We imagine that God must estimate things by human standards. To us that appears great which glitters and dazzles, which makes a show and a noise. Before God, however, that alone is great, which is born of him. Which of these is *true* greatness, is seen in its duration. What man regards as great and glorious, is consumed by the tooth of time—it becomes so small and miserable that we recognize it no more. Whatever is divinely great rises above the dust; and when it has attained its full greatness, we are disposed to ask: "Does this really originate in so small a beginning?" God makes a small beginning, but reaches a great ending; man starts with great things, but ends in little or nothing. Therefore, if you desire to receive the Lord worthily, you must receive him by suffering his Spirit to humble you. Those that went before him, "cut down branches from the trees, and strewed them in the way." Are you, also, able to do this? No, our country produces no palm trees, and if we should wish to take other branches, such as we find in our country, we would find that the Lord has already stripped our trees of their foliage, so that we might not deceive ourselves with so improper a sacrifice. Nevertheless, you must know where a suitable palm tree grows. Go into the garden of your own heart—enter it at once. Behold, there stands a palm tree with a tall, slender trunk—it reaches far up into the heavens. This tree is your pride, your opinion of yourself, your conceit, in view of your own virtues, accomplishments or possessions. Mount it and cut down its branches, yea, take off its entire top, so that it will grow

no more. And now strew it all, all in the way before the Lord. Over these he will ride into your Jerusalem—into the city of your heart—with greater joy than that with which he entered the ancient city. Whatever is lofty, shall be brought low. On that day He alone shall be great and glorious. "The multitude spread their garments in the way." Your Lord no longer enters visibly. Quiet and unobserved he makes his entrance into the hearts of men. Lay aside the old state-dress of your own righteousness. You are acquainted with this false mask, in which we love to appear. We wish to hide our sins before God and man. The garment of our own righteousness is, after all, entire, only on the outside; inside, quite within, it is torn, and continues to tear as we grow in years. It has only the appearance of comfort, but inside, quite within, it is cold, so cold that our very bones might shiver. Lay off this old garment and confess to your Lord: "I am poor, and naked, and bare." And he will rather enter your heart over this old garment than over those which the poor people spread in the way. The old shall pass away—on that day all things shall become new. And now, when you shall have humbled yourself, when you shall have cast aside the court-dress—that miserable garment of self-righteousness—and broken down the branches of your pride, then, indeed, with the people that went before and after him, you will learn to exclaim: "Hosanna to the Son of David!" This Hosanna signifies nothing else than Oh help me! Help, for I cannot help myself. Save me, for I cannot save myself. "As the hart panteth after the water-brook, so panteth my soul after thee, O God." Dear Christian, if you have ever truly felt your poverty, then you have also addressed a Hosanna to your Deliverer; but, if you have not, then may the hour be nigh when you may do so! For you must first become poor, before you can become rich; you must first cry Hosanna, before you can sing Hallelujah. But mark! there is yet another Hosanna in our text: "Hosanna in the highest." This "Hosanna in the highest," is the prayer of the angels who beseech the Lord for help on your behalf. And if *they* pray for you, then you have the best reason to pray for yourself. After the Hosanna comes the song of praise: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" Only he that *needs* help can properly celebrate Advent; only he that *feels* this need of help, can sing a hymn of praise to his Saviour. Then join in the song to-

day, from the depth of your heart; then sing to-day with joyful lips: "Blessed art thou that cometh in the name of the Lord!" No human name can help me, for sin and guilt cleave to all human names. No one that comes in his own name can render me any assistance; he must come in the name of God. Against him, against him alone, have I sinned; with him, with him alone, there is, also, forgiveness. And thou, Son of God, hast a name which is above every name. Thou comest in the name of Him who can "blot out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us," who can take away the terror of the law.

Accept my thanks for thy warm love,
Which brought thee from the heights above!
Prepare thyself, Oh Church of Christ!

"The watchers on the mountain
Proclaim the Bridegroom near;
Go meet Him, as He cometh,
With hallelujahs clear.
The marriage-feast is waiting,
The gates wide open stand;
Up, up, ye heirs of glory;
The Bridegroom is at hand!"

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Divine Rest: or Scriptural Views of the Sabbath. By John S. Stone, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. The discussion embraces the following points: (1) The Institution of the Sabbath, cotemporary with the creation of man; (2) Consideration of Objections against its early institution; (3) Proof of its early institution and universal obligation; (4) Argument for the change of the day from the seventh to the first; (5) What the hallowing of the day requires; (6) Benefits of a duly Sanctified Sabbath; (7) Sinfulness of its desecration; (8) Means by which its sanctification may best be secured. The great aim of the author seems to be of a practical character, to urge the faithful observance of the day of rest, and thus to secure all the blessedness which its sanctification contemplates, and is designed to impart.

The Christian Sacraments: or Scriptural Views of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. By John S. Stone, D. D., Griswold Lecturer in

the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in Philadelphia. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. In this Treatise the author presents the subject of the Sacraments, in accordance with his interpretation of the Scriptures, and the standards of his Church, regarding truth as the only instrument which the Spirit uses in regeneration. The work is divided into three parts: (1) The Introduction, which discusses the New Birth—Preaching—the Relation of the Sacraments to Preaching; (2) Baptism; (3) The Lord's Supper. Dr. Stone is a forcible and interesting writer, and, although we may not always reach the same conclusions, we cannot fail to admire his candor and earnest spirit.

The Gospels: With Moral Reflections on each verse. By Pasquier Quesnel. With an Introductory Essay. By Rev. Daniel Wilson, D. D. Revised by Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D. In Two Volumes. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. Although Quesnel was a Roman Catholic, and retained many of the errors of his Church, yet his whole life seems to have been consecrated to the love of his Saviour, and Bishop Wilson, speaking of his *Reflections*, says: "We have nothing in practical divinity so sweet, so spiritual, so interior, as to the real life of grace—so rich, so copious, so original. We have nothing that extols the grace of God, and abases and lowers man, so entirely." The work is not a Commentary, either critical or popular, but a collection of practical reflections on the gospels, devotional, original, striking and suggestive, eminently adapted to promote spiritual enjoyment, and Christian culture.

The Christ of the Apostles' Creed: The Voice of the Church against Arianism, Strauss and Renan. By W. A. Scott, D. D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. We have here presented a series of discourses, following the order of the Apostles' Creed, with special reference to the anti-Christian theories of the present day, delivered in the course of the author's routine of pastoral duty. In his elucidations, he makes use of Witsius, Pearson, and other great expounders of the Creed, yet he modifies and works up the whole to suit his purpose, with an independent and earnest mind. The discussions might be condensed, and the arrangement, sometimes, be more methodical, yet we must not forget the original design of their preparation requiring amplifications and explanations. The style is popular, the expositions pointed and instructive, and the argument better fitted to strengthen the believer than to remove real difficulties and convince the sceptic. On the *Descensus*, he differs from the Reformers and most of our old Lutheran divines, maintaining that "He descended into hell," means nothing more than that Christ underwent all that was predicable of man's dissolution, that he completed his redemptive work, by dying just as we do, that his body was buried, and his soul went immediately to God.

The Resurrection of the Dead. By Rev. George S. Mott. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. The writer gives us the Scriptural teachings on this important subject, and satisfactorily replies to the objections urged against the doctrine. The discussion is clear, concise and forcible. It is a valuable addition to our religious literature, and will not fail to produce an impression.

Manual of the Lives of the Popes, From St. Peter to Pius IX. By John Charles Earle, A. B. First American from the last London

Edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. This volume bears the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Baltimore, and is, of course written from a Roman Catholic stand-point. The biographies are necessarily brief, yet they contain all the material facts, civil and ecclesiastical, of the three hundred and nine Pontificates, claimed by Papal authorities, with nearly all omission of controversial questions. It is a valuable compendium, and will be useful for reference, to the Protestant student as well as to those who are in sympathy with the author. We thank the publisher for the service he has rendered in presenting the work to the American public.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. Hackett, D. D. With the co-operation of Ezra Abbot, A. M., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Parts I., II. and III., of this American reprint, have appeared under the most favorable auspices, and, compared with the English edition, the work is a great improvement. It contains important supplementary matter, furnished by some of our most eminent American scholars, which imparts greater completeness to the original work, the reputation of which, in the study and illustration of the Scriptures, is fully established. The American editors are well qualified for the task they have undertaken. The numbers before us, are characterized by the same excellencies which mark all the publications of this House. The text is clear, and the illustrations numerous and good. The entire work, comprising about thirty numbers, will be issued in monthly parts, each one containing one hundred and twelve pages, and sold only by subscription.

Beyond the Mississippi: From the Great River to the Great Ocean. Life and Adventure on the Prairies, Mountains, and Pacific Coast. By Albert D. Richardson, author of "Field, Dungeon and Escape." Hartford, Conn. The volume before us contains more than two hundred illustrations, from photographs and original sketches, of the Prairies, Mountains, Deserts, Rivers, Mines, Cities, Indians, Pioneers, and Great Natural Curiosities of the new States and Territories. The work is highly creditable to American art, and abounds in the most valuable information in regard to the Great West. It seems to be the result of an immense amount of labor, and cannot fail to have a most extended circulation. Mr. Richardson is well known as a writer, and his opportunities for gathering material have been more than ordinary, and his powers of description are the very best.

The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby. The Personal History of David Copperfield. By Charles Dickens. With Original Illustrations, by S. Eytinge, Jr. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. We have received two more volumes of the beautiful Diamond Series of Dickens' works, now in course of publication by Ticknor & Fields. They resemble, in all respects, their predecessors, in compactness, elegance and convenience. The regularity with which the serial is issued, indicates how successfully the recently awakened interest in Dickens is maintained. The illustrations are capital. The productions of Mr. Eytinge, in this direction, are seldom equaled.

God's Work—Our Ebenezer. Eighteenth Anniversary of the Pastorate of Rev. J. George Butler, of St. Paul's Lutheran Church. Washington, D. C., June 7, 1867. M'Gill & Witherow.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXII.

Article.	Page.
I. LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN HUSS,.....	473
By Rev. J. J. SMYTH, A. M., Pleasantville, Pa.	
II. HISTORY OF THE CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,.....	502
By Prof. L. W. HEYDENREICH, A. M., Bethlehem, Pa.	
III. SOBER-MINDEDNESS,.....	524
By H. L. BAUGHER, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.	
IV. COVENANT OF SALT,.....	532
V. CONVERSION,.....	536
By Rev. HENRY E. JACOBS, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.	
VI. THE DELIVERY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION,.....	543
By Rev. REUBEN WEISER, Manchester, Md.	
VII. THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST,.....	559
By Rev. JOHN S. CRUMBAUGH, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.	
VIII. ARTICLE SECOND OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION,.....	567
By SAMUEL SPRECHER, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.	
IX. THE PREACHING BEFORE THE REFORMATION,.....	596
By Rev. J. D. SEVERINGHAUS, A. M., Richmond, Ind.	
X. THE ADVENT OF CHRIST,.....	608
By Rev. J. B. RATH, A. M., Bethlehem, Pa.	
XI. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....	616

The Evangelical Quarterly Review contains an attractive variety of articles: *Chaucer*, by Prof. Ferrier; *Self Consecration, the Condition of a Successful Ministry*, by Dr. Peabody; *Confessions of Faith*, by Dr. Conrad; *Pulpit Dialectics*, by Prof. Wynn; *The Person of Our Lord and his Sacramental presence*, by Dr. Krauth; *The Laging on of Hands*, by Dr. Spear; and *Martin Luther at the Diet of Worms*. We hope to find a place for extracts from some of these in our columns.—*The Evangelist, New York*.

A cursory examination of the contents of this number indicates that they are possessed of more than usual interest and variety. The leading one is that on the Person of Christ, by Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth, which is a very calm and thorough review of the positions in regard to the doctrines of the Lutheran Church.—*The German Reformed Messenger*.

We are glad to welcome our old friend, the *Evangelical Review*, one of the best American Quarterlies. The July number contains eight articles in all, characterized by the usual freshness and interest pertaining to its contributions. Professor Stoeber, of Pennsylvania College, is the Editor who knows how to make it worthy of the patronage of the Church it represents.—*The Western Missionary, Dayton, O.*

The July number of this admirable *Review* is no less valuable in its contributions to the literary and theological world than any of its predecessors. Among the articles we notice one from the pen of Prof. C. P. Krauth, D. D.; on the Person of our Lord and his Sacramental Presence, an able vindication of the Lutheran view of this subject. This Quarterly is worthy the patronage of the entire Church.—*Evangelical Lutheran, Charlotte, N. C.*

The present number possesses unusual merit. The articles are all of a highly important character, and display much talent and research on the part of their respective authors. The fact that for eighteen years the *Review* has been before the church, is a sufficient guarantee of its merits. It deserves to be extensively patronized, both by the clergy and the intelligent laity.—*The Lutheran Visitor*.

The Evangelical Quarterly Review contains some valuable articles. The first is an appreciative one on Chaucer; the second a philosophising essay on Self-Consecration containing some good thoughts; the fifth is on the Person of our Lord and his Sacramental Presence, by Dr. Krauth, profound in thought, beautiful in style, sound in doctrine, excellent in every respect, for the sake of which every minister in our Church ought to get the *Review*. The seventh gives an interesting account of Martin Luther at the Diet of Worms.—*Lutheran Standard, Columbus, O.*

INDEX TO VOL. XVIII.

- Advent of Christ, 608.
 Ahlfeld, Rev. F., Sermon by, 608.
 Ananias and Sapphira, 103.
 Annual of Scientific Discovery, 468.
 Atlantic Monthly, 166.
 Atwater's Logic, 467.
 Arthur Merton, 470.
 Augsburg Confession, Delivery of, 544.
 Augsburg Confession, 568.
 Authorship of the Augsburg Confession, 279.
 Baltzly, Rev. J. B., Art. by, 147.
 Baptismal Regeneration, 46.
 Bartlett's Memoirs, 468.
 Baugher, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 524.
 Benefits of the Communion, 147.
 Bergstresser, Rev. R., Art. by, 182.
 Bernard's Progress of Christian Doctrine, 464.
 Binding the Sheaves, 469.
 Bird's Charles Wesley, 324.
 Botts' Great Rebellion, 469.
 Bradley's Engravings, 460.
 Briggs' Memoirs, 164.
 Brockett's Civil War, 468.
 Brown, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 120.
 Busy Hands, 470.
 Canon of the Holy Scriptures, 502.
 Carpenter's Six Months at the White House, 325.
 Carpenter's Lincoln, 470.
 Chambers' Encyclopedia, 325.
 Charlesworth's Sequel, 325.
 Chaucer, 329.
 Chemnitz, Translation from, 536.
 Christmas Presents, 94.
 Church Discipline, 182.
 Cole's Voyage of Life, 326.
 Confessions of Faith, 331.
 Conington's Aeneid, 466.
 Conrad, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 351.
 Covenant of Salt, 532.
 Conversion, 536.
 Coppee's Songs of Praise, 164.
 Dana's Life, 323.
 Daniel's Seventy Weeks, 204.
 D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, 163;
 Davis' Speeches, 168.
 Dickens' Works, 326, 618.
 Diet of Worms, 449.
 Divinity of Christ, 559.
 Donald Fraser, 469.
 Draytons and the Davenants, 163.
 Earle's Manual of the Popes, 617.
 Evidences of a Future State, 249.
 Faire Gospeller's Life, 466.
 Father Clement, 469.
 Ferrier, Prof. E., Art. by, 329.
 Fronde's England, 165.
 Future State, 249.
 Garver, Rev. D., Reminiscences of, 233.
 General Synod and its Assailants, 120.
 Gerhard, Translation from, 310.
 Gould's Good English, 468.
 Greenwald, Rev. Dr., Arts. by, 103, 204.
 Greeley's American Conflict, 326.
 Goodyear's Life and Discoveries, 466.
 Hamline's Membr, 465.
 Harrison, Rev. Dr., Reminiscences of, 240.
 Harper's Monthly, 166.
 Haven's Pillars of Truth, 464.
 Hay, Rev. Dr., Arts. by, 6, 157.
 Helen M'Gregor, 470.
 Heydenreich, Prof. L. W., Arts. by, 94, 502.
 Holmes' Authorship of Shakespeare, 325.
 Home without Hands, 324.
 Hoppin's Old England, 466.
 Hours at Home, 165.
 How God Concurs in the Wicked Deeds of Men, 310.
 Howell's Venitian Life, 467.
 Huss, Life and Times of, 473.
 Hutter, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 290.
 Ide's Bible Pictures, 464.
 Inauguration Addresses, 1.

- Irving's Spanish Papers, 324.
 Jacobs, Rev. H. E., Arts. by, 310, 536.
 Jacobus' Notes, 323.
 John's Message, 110.
 Krauth, Rev. Dr., Arts. by, 82, 395.
 Kurtz, Rev. Dr. B., Reminiscences of, 25.
 Lange's Commentary, 161, 462.
 Lackland's Homespun, 467.
 Laying on of Hands, 436.
 Liber Librorum, 464.
 Lochman, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 1.
 Martin Luther, 449.
 M'Clelland's Sermons, 323.
 M'Climock's Cyclopædia, 464.
 Millennium, 216.
 Milman's Church History, 322.
 Missouri Synod, 157.
 Mott's Resurrection of the Dead, 617.
 Muenscher's Proverbs, 323.
 Notices of New Publications, 161, 322, 462, 616.
 Omnipotence of Loving Kindness, 164.
 Original Sin, 567.
 Origin of Christmas Presents, 94.
 Origin of Moral Evil, 163.
 Our Little One, 324.
 Our Young Folks, 166.
 Palfrey's New England, 165.
 Palgrave's Essays on Art, 467.
 Peabody, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 340.
 Person of Our Lord, 395.
 Phelps' New Birth, 323.
 Plitt, Prof., Translation from, 169.
 Powell's National Picture, 166.
 Prayer, 290.
 Preaching before the Reformation, 596.
 Prime's Dear Jerusalem, 466.
 Pulpit Dialectics, 380.
 Quesnel's Gospels, 617.
 Randolph's Hopefully Waiting, 164.
 Rath, Rev. J. B., Art. by, 608.
 Rebellion Record, 165.
 Relation of the Sermon to the Church Year, 169.
 Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers, 25, 232.
 Revelation of John, 216.
 Reuss, Translation from, 502.
 Richardson's Beyond the Mississippi, 618.
 Riverside Magazine, 166.
 Sacramental Presence, 395.
 Samson's Elements of Art, 461.
 Schaff's Christian Church, 322.
 Schenkel's Character of Jesus, 322.
 Schism and Protestantism, 94.
 Scott's Apostles' Creed, 617.
 Seiss' Apocalypse, 326.
 Seiss' Psalms and Canticles, 465.
 Self-Consecration, Condition of a Successful Ministry, 340.
 Severinghaus, Rev. J. D., Art. by, 169.
 Simson's History of the Gospels, 325.
 Shedd's Christian Doctrine, 56.
 Shedd's Homiletics, 463.
 Shields' Book of Common Prayer, 162.
 Sober-Mindedness, 524.
 South's Sermons, 463.
 Smith's Bible Dictionary, 618.
 Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, 162.
 Spear, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 436.
 Sprague, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 264.
 Stille's Sanitary Commission, 326.
 Stone's Divine Rest, 616.
 Stone's Christian Sacraments, 616.
 Strong's Cyclopædia, 464.
 Stuckenberg, Rev. J. H. W., Art. by, 279.
 Theological Inquiry, 264.
 Traver, Rev. A., Art. by, 249.
 Trench's Studies in the Gospels, 463.
 Valentine, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 14.
 Weidman, Rev. J., Art. by, 94.
 Weiser, Rev. R., Art. by, 544.
 Whately's Martin Luther, 469.
 Whedon's Commentary, 162.
 Whittier's Tent in the Beach, 329.
 Wilken, Prof. J. F., Art. by, 110, 216.
 Winslow's Heaven Opened, 164.
 Win and Wear, 469.
 Women of the Gospel, 466.
 Worley, Prof. D., Art. by, 46.
 Wynn, Rev. W. H., Art. by, 380.

